

FBIS

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 070

11 April 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Press Conference in Moscow Introduces New Booklet	AA 1
Shitikov Addresses Press Conference	AA 2
TASS Reviews Booklet	AA 4
Further TASS Review	AA 5
Booklet Examines USSR-U.S. Parity	AA 6
Zagladin Interviewed on U.S. Interim Proposals [Budapest]	AA 7
Discusses U.S. Missile Deployment [Vienna VOLKSSTIMME 7 Apr]	AA 12
PRAVDA Hits 'Absurdity' of Interim Option [Grigoryev, 7 Apr]	AA 15
Commentator Contrasts U.S., USSR Arms Proposals [Shishlin]	AA 18
PRAVDA Rebuts Pentagon's 'Soviet Military Power' [editorial article, 8 Apr]	AA 20
TASS Reviews KOMMUNIST Article on Arms Race [No 5]	AA 26

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Grishin Welcomes Gromyko on Return From Prague [PRAVDA 9 Apr]	BB 1
CEMA Session on Environmental Protection Held [IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]	BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions & Answers' [Kachanov, Shishkin, Kavolev, Semenov]	CC 1
U.S. 'Dangerous' Arms Policy	CC 1
U.S. Policy Toward Spain	CC 3
Greek, U.S. Views on U.S. Bases	CC 4
Political Situation in Thailand	CC 5
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Andrianov, Volskiy, Nekrasov]	CC 6
Warsaw Pact Ministers Meeting	CC 6
Moscow Response to 'Interim Option'	CC 7
U.S.-Japanese 'Alliance'	CC 9
U.S., Israeli Interventionists' Actions	CC 10
Support for 'Peace' Movement	CC 12
Socialist International Concludes Congress	CC 13
Brandt Reelected Chairman	CC 13
CPSU Central Committee Message [PRAVDA 9 Apr]	CC 13

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Gromyko Article Notes U.S. Business 'Exploitation' A 1
 [MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA Apr]

CHINA

USSR Border Trade Accord With PRC Reported B 1
 PRC Coach Interviewed in Beijing on Tournaments B 1

EASTERN EUROPE

Defense Minister Ustinov Concludes Visit to GDR F 1
 7 Apr Activities [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Apr] F 1
 Comments on Military Potential F 4
 [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Apr]
 Report on Berlin Departure F 6
 [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Apr]
 Returns to Moscow 9 Apr F 6
 Romanov Attends Karl Marx Conference in GDR F 7
 Departs Moscow 10 Apr F 7
 Report on Arrival F 7
 Conference Opens 11 Apr F 7
 Romanov Receives Polish Ambassador in Leningrad F 8
 Wozniak, Warsaw PZPR Delegation Visit Moscow F 8
 USSR Embassy Protests Flag Misuse in West Berlin F 8
 Zimyanin, Stukalin Meet BCP Agitprop Visitors F 9
 [PRAVDA 3 Apr]
 Talyzin Attends Hungarian Liberation Obsequies F 9
 [PRAVDA 3 Apr]

WESTERN EUROPE

Soviet Spokesman on Future of Ties With France G 1
 [Paris LE MONDE 10-11 Apr]
 UNESCO Employees Among Soviets Expelled [AFP] G 1
 'Bandits' Attack Soviet Buildings in France G 2
 Marseilles Consulate G 2
 Additional Reportage G 2
 Aeroflot Office G 2
 French 'Intelligence Activity' in Africa Cited G 2
 USSR Cites Books on CIA Activities in Europe G 3
 'Open Secret' [Malyshev] G 3
 'The CIA's Dirty Work' [KOMMUNIST No 5] G 4
 UK's Fym 'Working As One' With U.S. in Mideast G 5
 Belgian Foreign Minister, Delegation in USSR G 6
 Foreign Minister's Arrival Noted G 6
 Parliamentarians Tour Moscow G 6

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

USSR's Safronchuk Meets With Iranian Official [IRNA]	H 1
Aeroflot To Resume Flights to Tehran 5 May	H 1
USSR, Iraq Exchange Treaty Anniversary Telegrams	H 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Politburo Examines USSR Energy Program	R 1
[PRAVDA 9 Apr]	
Ministers Dismissed; New Appointments Made	R 2
Politburo Expresses Gratitude	R 2
Labor Committee Chairman Replaced	R 2
Estonian Supreme Soviet Change	R 2
Obituary of Kolkhoz Organizer Released	R 3
Biography Given	R 3
Signatories of Obituary [PRAVDA 9 Apr]	R 3
PRAVDA Outlines Contents of Kommunist No 5	R 3
[PRAVDA 8 Apr]	
IZVESTIYA Editorial Marks Bolshevik Anniversary	R 4
[7 Apr]	
Sentence Passed on Corrupt Militia Personnel	R 6
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Apr]	

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Party, State Decision on Agriculture Adopted	T 1
PRAVDA on Grain Crop Situation, Food Program	T 1
[7 Apr]	
Briefs: Azerbaijan Cotton Cultivation;	T 3
Uzbek Rice Cultivation	

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

USSR Launches Cosmos, Communications Satellites	U 1
Cosmos-1451	U 1
'Raduga' Satellite	U 1
Soviet Role in KOSPAS-SARSAT System Detailed	U 1
[Konovalov in IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]	
Satellite TV Transmissions Received in Kola	U 3
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 Apr]	

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Air Defense Forces Day Marked 10 April	V 1
Marshal Koldunov Preview	V 1
Ustinov Greetings, Order	V 1
Ceremonial Meeting 8 April [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Apr]	V 2
Deputy Commander Yurasov Remarks	V 2
Deputy Chief Mikhaylov Statement	V 3

LD080939 Moscow TASS in English 0851 GMT 8 Apr 83

Answering to the questions asked by a number of Western correspondents about the so-called "interim proposal" put forward by President Reagan, Oleg Bykov, Ph.D. (history) deputy director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, said that in principle that proposal did not differ from the "zero option" advanced earlier.

III. 11 Apr 83

AA 2

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

The "interim proposal" could not in any way promote progress at the Geneva talks, as it provided for the deployment of new U.S. nuclear medium-range systems in Western Europe. And this would mean the emergence of a new component in the nuclear equation currently existing between the sides.

An NBC correspondent asked if the Soviet Union would consent to such an agreement which would provide for the deployment of a certain part, not the entire number, of new U.S. missiles in Europe.

Major-General Konstantin Mikhaylov, a spokesman for the Ministry of Defense of the USSR, answered that to consent to such a deployment would mean to agree to an imbalance in medium-range nuclear systems. He recalled that the currently existing parity includes U.S. forward-based systems, and the missiles of Great Britain and France. The balance should be accurate, it must ensure equality and equal security of the sides and take into consideration all medium-range systems, stationed in Europe, he said. General Mikhaylov stressed that the Soviet Union has every right to deploy a certain part of its medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the country as a counterbalance to U.S. nuclear systems based in the Far East and the Indian Ocean basin. At the same time the USSR wishes no superiority for itself, but is striving only to maintain the equilibrium.

Some Western correspondents asked questions concerning the Soviet military concept. Professor Daniel Proektor, leading expert of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said: There is a great deal of difference between the NATO "concept of deterrence" based on ideas of superiority and first use of nuclear weapons, and the Soviet concept of containment based on the idea of equality and equal security, and unilateral renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons.

Touching on the speculations in the West that in its plans on nuclear-missile weapons in Europe the Soviet Union hopes for a change of the administration in the United States, Professor Vitaliy Zhurkin, director of the Institute of the USA and Canada of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, [name, title as received -- Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 0955 GMT on 8 April carries an identical report on this press conference which identifies Zhurkin as "deputy director [zamestitel direktora] of the Institute of the USA and Canada of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR," Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and SELSKAYA ZHIZN of 9 April also identify Zhurkin as deputy director of the institute] said: The Soviet Union conducts the talks not with the President or the Congress, but with the USA as another great power, and the approach of our country to the talks will invariably be determined by this principled line.

Shitikov Addresses Press Conference

LD090226 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] In Moscow today a press conference was held to mark the publication of the booklet entitled How to Avert the Threat to Europe.

The new booklet, which Soviet and foreign journalists received before the press conference, is a continuation of a dialogue with readers, both in the USSR and abroad, that began with the publication of the booklet The Threat to Europe in November 1981. Since then important events have taken place in the international arena. The new booklet expounds the essence of the Soviet military doctrine and the NATO dual decision on Eurostrategic weapons.

The booklet aims to answer questions of European security, such as the importance of the military-strategic balance between the East and West and reveal the danger of Reagan's zero option to the destiny of Europe and the world.

Comrade Shitikov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, and scientists and experts who participated in compiling the book spoke at the press conference. Opening the press conference, Comrade Shitikov said:

[Begin Shitikov recording] The Soviet Union and other socialist countries propose that constructive, realistic measures be implemented with the aim of eliminating this threat by halting the arms race and lessening military confrontation. The peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community, expounded by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov at the solemn meeting on 21 December 1982 devoted to the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation and the Prague declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries, put forward an alternative to nuclear catastrophe and call for broad international cooperation to preserve civilization and life on earth. The central theme of the booklet offered for your attention is a discussion of the essence of this alternative.

In attempting to show the reasoning of the peace-loving initiatives of the Soviet Union, the authors of the booklet dwell in detail on what is very often glossed over in silence in the West: the military and political content of our proposals and our unilateral pledges. The new booklet focuses attention on yet another important fact that is directly linked to the question of how to eliminate the nuclear threat to Europe.

It is well known over here, but unfortunately little known in the West, that the Soviet Union is ready to go very far on this matter and is putting forward a program for a radical solution involving the renunciation of all types of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical weapons, intended for striking targets in Europe. Then there would not be aircraft carrying nuclear bombs, Pershing missiles, cruise missiles, SS-20 missiles or battlefield nuclear weapons here. Today one cannot help wondering why this important Soviet initiative is being glossed over in silence. Evidently the governments concerned do not wish to accept it. Meanwhile, the idea of completely ridding Europe of nuclear weapons -- together, naturally, with a reduction in other types of weapons -- is one of the most widespread demands put forward by the European peoples.

The U.S. President's so-called interim option, which was put forward with the aim of weakening the European peoples' resistance and starting the deployment of the new U.S. nuclear missiles a few steps away -- so to speak -- from the territory of the Soviet Union and our allies this year, is absolutely incompatible with these demands. The Soviet public fully supports the stance on questions of nuclear arms limitation that was expounded in Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's replies to questions by a PRAVDA correspondent and Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's statements at the press conference held here last week with full resolve.

I would like to bring your attention to another feature of this publication: It expounds the Soviet public's viewpoint on the problem of guaranteeing security in the nuclear age. Peace based on a balance of fear is a fragile, unstable structure. The balance of fear must give way to a balance of trust. The truly necessary and most effective way of guaranteeing security is the course of detente and disarmament, and this booklet is devoted to substantiating the necessity of that course. In our opinion, the publication of this booklet and what will be said here today are one effort aimed at strengthening trust and helping people find a way out of the dangerous impasse that they are condemned to by the arms race and the whipping up of tension. [end recording]

Replying to numerous questions by journalists, Comrade Bykov, doctor of historical sciences and deputy director of the Institute of World Economic and International Relations, touched on Reagan's so-called interim option.

[Begin Bykov recording] Speaking in terms of the concept itself and the approach, the interim option can in no way promote progress. Why? First, because it provides for the deployment of new U.S. nuclear systems in Western Europe -- systems that were not there before and that, if deployed, would destroy the balance of nuclear forces that has come about in Europe. They will not only destroy it, but will represent a qualitatively new element in the existing nuclear equation. They are not simply additional systems, but systems that will essentially expand the U.S. central strategic nuclear forces' potential for coming right up to the Soviet Union. In this case it will be possible to speak of a new situation: one in which the existing balance is destroyed.

As far as the reductions that are proposed here are concerned, this is also an inequitable and unjust approach. It turns out that in exchange for a certain reduction in the quantity of U.S. systems, which are proposed to be deployed for the first time, it is suggested that the Soviet Union make a considerable cut in its forces on conditions that are completely unacceptable. Therefore, I imagine that it is difficult to see how there can be any progress as long as this interim option or its possible variants remain on the negotiating table, in essence, there has been no fundamental change. [end recording]

TASS Reviews Booklet

LD082136 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS -- The Soviet Union is in a special strategic situation and is compelled, for defensive purposes, to ensure not only a general equilibrium of strength, above all with the USA, but also a regional equilibrium in various directions, each of which has its own military specificity. First of all, the size of the Armed Forces of the USSR and its allies must measure up to the size of the defended area, the overall length of the frontiers and the nature of the potential threats. And these indicators have none anywhere in the world to even approximately approach or equal them. The armies of the Warsaw Treaty countries are called upon to protect a territory totalling 23.5 million square kilometres. The NATO armies, on the other hand, protect in Europe slightly over two million square kilometres, or one-eleventh of that area.

These figures are cited in the booklet "How To Avert the Threat to Europe" published by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and by the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. It analyses the present-day developments in Europe and all over the world.

Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that owing to its favourable geographical location, the United States is capable of defending its own national frontiers with a minimal force. In contrast, to ensure dependable defence and guarantee equilibrium, the Soviet Union is forced to distribute its strength along the entire perimeter of its frontiers and, moreover, see to a rough parity on the seas and oceans, from where it is increasingly threatened by the American nuclear navy, the booklet points out.

One more important point, the booklet continues. When assessing the military balance in Europe, it is essential to consider the whole complex of NATO and Warsaw Treaty armed forces and armaments, and not arbitrarily single out separate components, as this is often done by Western experts.

The NATO bloc, for example, is superior to the Warsaw Treaty Organization in total manpower, number of combat-ready divisions, and anti-tank weaponry, and has approximately equal numbers of artillery and armour. It is a little behind the Warsaw Treaty in the number of tactical aircraft. On the whole, however, there is an obvious rough balance of strength in conventional armaments.

Further TASS Review

LD090749 Moscow TASS in English 0722 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS -- "In the current politico-military NATO vocabulary deterrence is a widely used term. We understand it to mean containment by terror or intimidation. And it is a fact that in the policies pursued by the United States and its allies the chief emphasis in deterrence is being made on intimidation, threats, and terror." This is said in a booklet called "How To Avert the Threat to Europe" published by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. The booklet analyses the present stage of the development of the situation in Europe and in the world as a whole.

"As we see it, deterrence by the menace of armed force cannot be the only, and much less the chief means of ensuring international security... The Soviet Union rejects the standpoint of those who are trying to prevail on people that force and armaments are and will always be the deciding factor," the authors of the booklet point out.

"The NATO concept of deterrence contains the idea of continuously increasing military power for the sake of still greater deterrence, which presumably makes security more secure," the publication says further. "But all it can achieve is the opposite. In the final analysis, the building up of nuclear arsenals and the drive for military superiority can only undermine security."

"The concept of nuclear deterrence, it is maintained in the West, is based on the factor of containment which is said, in principle, to be ingrained in nuclear weapons. Certainly, we recognise that nuclear weapons are also fraught with the utmost danger for the potential aggressor, and that this knowledge may (?act) as a deterrent. But reliance on nuclear deterrence as the allegedly most effective way of averting war is liable to lead to a conclusion that is contrary to common sense: that nuclear weapons must exist until the end of time.... Yet the devotees of deterrence rely precisely on an equilibrium of fear."

"It is wholly understandable that such a foundation is much too untrustworthy to ensure security.... The equilibrium of fear must give place to an equilibrium of confidence," the authors of the booklet declare.

Booklet Examines USSR-U.S. Parity

LD101229 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS -- "If we take the European nuclear potentials of both sides as a package, we will see that they balance out, that parity was in no way upset by the deployment of Soviet SS-20 missile," says the booklet entitled "How To Avert the Threat to Europe" published by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and by the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. A rough parity in medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe has existed between the USSR and the USA, and their allies, for already a number of years -- each of the sides has roughly a thousand delivery vehicles, the booklet points out. In the case of the USSR this number includes ground-based missiles the West calls SS-20, SS-4 and SS-5, plus medium-range bombers. In the case of NATO, this number includes the U.S. forward-based nuclear force (FB-111A, F-111 and F-4 aircraft and carrier-based aircraft) and, in addition, the nuclear armaments of Britain and France (ground-based S-2 and S-3 missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and bombers).

The Western states, the booklet points out, have more than once modernized their medium-range nuclear armaments. They are also doing so at present. This means that the West already has missile analogous in capacity to the Soviet SS-20. It is important to stress that the medium-range delivery vehicles of the Atlantic alliance are already now able to lift 50 percent more warheads in one launch/sortie than the corresponding vehicles of the Soviet Union. The booklet refutes the assertions of the West that the USSR "is not modernizing but radically upgrading its medium-range weaponry". The booklet emphasizes that the Soviet Union did not upset the nuclear balance in Europe when it substituted the new missiles for the old. When stationing a new SS-20 missile, it removed one or two old missiles, which were dismantled and not deployed in other areas.

The new missiles have the same mission as the old: to counterweigh NATO's medium-range weapons in Europe, the booklet says. What is still more pertinent is that owing to their technical characteristics they cannot strike at the territory of the United States and put U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles out of commission. Therefore, attempts to portray Soviet medium-range missiles as a first-strike weapon is a perversion of the facts that is intended to frighten people.

No less groundless are the attempts to portray Soviet medium-range weapons as a means of political pressure or blackmail vis-a-vis Western Europe or the United States. The entire history of Soviet foreign policy shows that it is wholly inimical to any policy "from strength", to obtaining political and economic concessions from other countries by the threat of armed force, the booklet stresses.

ZAGLADIN INTERVIEWED ON U.S. INTERIM PROPOSALS

LD072347 Budapest Domestic Television Service in Hungarian 1855 GMT 7 Apr 83

[From the "Panorama" program: Alajos Churudinak interview with Vadim Zagladin, "one of those who prepare the decisions of the USSR's international policy" -- recorded with both speaking in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation]

[Text] [Churudinak] When we search for the reasons behind the changes in U.S. policy, which has become more belligerent, leading U.S. politicians always say, always allude to the fact, that it is events in Afghanistan, Poland and Kampuchea which have forced them to change their opinions of the world and of the USSR. What is your opinion of this American argument?

[Zagladin] This is a weak argument, but the essential thing is not its weakness, rather its provocative nature. Let us look at what happened in Afghanistan. The Soviet troops moved in in December 1979. Since May 1978 the Americans have carried out various actions. In June 1979 a consultation was convened in the United States -- I no longer remember the name of the city -- at which 200 representatives of the Pentagon and the CIA debated how to combat the Afghan revolution. So this is pure hypocrisy, since they were the ones who provoked the events in Afghanistan; they were the ones who forced the USSR to offer assistance. And now they are using this as a pretext.

I would like to draw your attention to the following: The present U.S. short-term factor did not develop after Afghanistan, Poland, Kampuchea, Vietnam, or I know not what. This policy follows from the general crisis of capitalism. To put it plainly: From the aggravation of the difficulties of capitalism. To put it more crudely: It is the consequence of those errors which in the period of detente the United States itself committed. This policy is a consequence of their calculation that the Americans want to exploit the difficulties of the socialist countries.

[Churudinak] So this means that the Americans have initiated a very sharp ideological, economic war against the socialist countries.

[Zagladin] A multifaceted war.

[Churudinak] And at the same time they initiated an arms race.

[Zagladin] Correct.

[Churudinak] For this reason I believe, and I may be wrong, that we have once again entered the cold war. Of course we do not yet speak openly about this, but at any rate for me it appears to be a fact. How do you see this? Have we really entered the cold war, as in the fifties?

[Zagladin] No, I have to say that I do not agree with you. I do not agree for the following reasons. First of all, the world is now very unbalanced. For let us just look at what the fifties were like, the cold war period. At that time all the capitalist countries represented an identical stance. It was then, for example, that NATO was created. The developing countries were still for the most part colonies; they did not hold an independent opinion. Our socialist system, too, was still weak; it was only in the formative phase.

Now, however, the Americans are exerting pressure on the whole world to cast it into cold war. Reagan and his administration have decided to fight against us with the help of B-1's, Tridents and Mx's. Others, however, say that this is not the right road, because they do not know if it will be possible to maintain capitalism in this way. But they do know that if war breaks out, everyone will perish. So they do not support the U.S. policy of confrontation. According to the circles of the neoconservatives, the neoliberals, the reformists of the bourgeoisie, there are other recipes too for the struggle to save capitalism. They are also fighting against us, but in different forms. For this reason the current situation cannot be equated with the cold war period. It is more complex, I would say that it is more composite.

But you are right in one thing -- and maybe in the most important issue -- that this current not short-term period is not merely an episode. This is a period that will be protracted. And what does the outcome depend on? First and foremost on the development of socialism. On socialism developing well, on whether it will be able to resolve the problems which arise. It is not possible in any way to solve all the problems. When one problem is solved another arises. This is a law of life.

[Chrudinak] In my opinion, the current U.S. policy, this extreme line of confrontation, is not only Reagan's policy, it is not just the policy of the current President. This process started earlier, and it may be expected to last a long time yet. What is your opinion about this? For, if I remember correctly, when Reagan was first elected U.S. President you also said that later Reagan would enter the path of realities and modify his earlier policy.

[Zagladin] I did not say that.

[Chrudinak] Maybe not now, but you said it at the time of Reagan's election.

[Zagladin] Yes, right at the start, it is true.

[Chrudinak] You said then that Reagan would enter the path of realities. In your opinion, could this political direction continue long to prevail?

[Zagladin] You know, I do and I do not agree with you. That there will be a struggle, no matter what sort of U.S. Administration there is -- that is the inevitability of the struggle -- this is a fact. But that this should be a confrontation is not inevitable. The struggle can be waged in different ways. The current administration, and I must add that Reagan did not personally choose this policy, because Reagan -- probably we are not alone in regretting this, but the Americans themselves also -- is not a markedly independent politician; behind him there stand certain forces which direct him and which have chosen this policy. Another administration, another President could adopt a different stance. So the struggle continues, but not necessarily in the form of military confrontation, as now.

Look, many of the European leaders do not advise a military war confrontation. They propose something else: They urge a political, ideological, economic contest. They strive to divide our countries ideologically, to differentiate them in order to intervene. But they do not propose a military confrontation, because they know that would threaten them too, us and them too, the whole of mankind. But at all events this is a threat. They want to avoid this. They will try to struggle without this.

[Chrudinak] What is your opinion of President Reagan's latest so-called interim solution, which he submitted in connection with the deployment of the medium-range missiles? Does this proposal contain anything new?

[Zagladin] When we speak about the interim option, we must ask: Interim between what? The option proposed by President Reagan is purely an interim, transitional option between the full deployment of 600 U.S. missiles -- or maybe even more missiles, as we are recently hearing -- and the partial deployment of these missiles. But here it is not a question of the reduction or complete annihilation of European nuclear weapons, or of the transitional steps leading to this.

So the current interim solution means the following: At present in the West there are some 1,000 targeting devices and 1,500 warheads directed at the countries of the Warsaw Treaty, first and foremost the USSR. They propose to increase this number. On the other hand, they propose to us that we should reduce our own 1,000 carrier devices. The idea of the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty, however, is what we also all confirmed with our signatures in Prague, that we should annihilate all kinds of nuclear weapons in Europe in general. But they do not reply to this. We propose that we reduce the present level of armaments to one-third, or to an even greater extent. Instead of this they say they must increase and we must reduce armament.

[Chrudinak] But to what do they allude when they reject the USSR's arms reduction proposals?

[Zagladin] They simply do not reply to them. The best method of rejection is simply not to answer. But this is not exactly courteous; it is not too good, not a very fine thing. They simply do not reply. One can allude to anything, there just simply is no answer. And now, I ask myself the following question -- to which actually there is no answer, and I say this honestly -- the Americans discuss with us in Geneva. [sentence as heard] They play the negotiating game. Reagan's proposal shows precisely that they are merely playing, not negotiating.

But just now, a few days ago, we heard another speech by the President. In this he proposed the star wars, the war waged in space. How did this proposal go? They will create a strong antimissile system which would allegedly be a new means of averting nuclear war. Of course, anything can be said about this. But we made an agreement with the United States about antimissile systems. They are now rejecting it, simply keeping quiet about it. Their proposal invalidates everything that has once been effected. But there also exists an international agreement, not Soviet-American but international, that we will not turn space into an arena for military operations, that we will not position military objects there. What is this space war, then? Is it a denial of the former agreement? The President is quiet about this too.

[Chrudinak] So here is President Reagan's interim proposal. What will the USSR's answer, counterproposal, be to this in Geneva?

[Zagladin] What in fact does Reagan want? For instance, on 15 February Weinberger made a speech -- no, sorry, it was not Weinberger but Vice President Bush who said the following on television: Gentlemen, no matter what the outcome of the talks on missile deployment, it will still take place. Reagan's interim proposal confirms this theory of Vice President Bush. If they deploy only one weapon more than what the West now has, we will be obliged to respond. How? First, in such a way as to neutralize the new danger that threatens us; and this is a very serious threat. The U.S. missiles could reach Hungary in 3, the USSR in 5 minutes. We do not even have enough time to set the defense system into operation. Therefore, we need a system that negates this threat.

On the other hand, since the U.S. missile could reach Hungary in 3 minutes and the USSR in 5, we must create a defense system that could reach the United States in 3 or 5 minutes. How? By technical means. I was once asked, I no longer remember where: Are you thinking of Cuba? Would you deploy missiles in Cuba? Why? Not at all. At that time, in connection with Cuba, we undertook a mutual commitment with the United States, and neither we nor the other socialist countries have ever infringed a single of its undertakings, and neither will they. Technology makes other solutions possible, and we will be forced to do this if the United States chooses this way.

[Chrudinak] Comrade Zagladin, does this mean that you do not believe that any kind of agreement can be reached at Geneva?

[Zagladin] No, no, that is not acceptable. I am speaking about possibilities that will become valid if the Americans carry out their threats, if they implement their present proposals. But I believe that the way is not closed that could lead to an agreement, to a kind of solution. Why is it not closed? First, the response to President Reagan's opinion and proposal is not unequivocal even in the United States, forces exist even there that hold other views. There are those who say that first of all the existing situation must be frozen. Therefore, the reduction in the level of armament must be attained not by changing the existing status quo. In my opinion this thought is correct. Thus, the situation either remains unaltered, or it will change a little to the West's advantage. All right. Let us wait and see how this will be. But the most important thing is to continue the discussions in order to reach an agreement. We do not want to disarm the West unilaterally, nor do we want to carry out unilateral disarmament.

[Chrudinak] President Reagan also mentioned that what he is doing is in fact a response to the Soviet military threat. Reagan also said that the USSR has not observed the unilateral freeze relating to the SS-20 missiles. What is your reply to this?

[Zagladin] We in the USSR are not in the habit of saying bad things about the heads of state of other countries, not even if these heads of state, if I may put it like this, have a hostile attitude toward us. Therefore, I do not want to say anything bad about President Reagan. However, speaking objectively, what Reagan alleges is a crude lie. Now that we are on this point, they have even admitted it. Weinberger himself admitted it. How? In the following way: They say that Mr Brezhnev proclaimed the freeze in June 1982, but that since then the number of missiles deployed in or directed toward Europe and Asia has grown by such or such a degree. I do not want to argue about the quantity. This is obvious nonsense. Anyway, that is not the question here. These words: and in Asia -- this was said by Weinberger, touch the essence of the matter. The number of our SS-20 missiles in Europe has not gone up by a single one; the number of SS-4 and SS-5 missiles, on the other hand, has significantly decreased. In this period we did not deploy a single missile that could reach Western Europe. As far as Asia is concerned, that is another issue. In Asia the Americans during this period have deployed F-16 aircraft and are deploying them in Hokkaido, Japan, and they have an enormous arsenal of medium-range weapons in the southern and central parts of Japan. Therefore, what Reagan is saying now, that the USSR is not observing its freeze commitments, is a lie because the USSR is observing them 100 percent. As far as Asia is concerned, we proposed discussions, but we did not receive an answer to this.

[Chrudinak] In his latest statement Yuriy Andropov said that the United States of America is going along an extremely dangerous path. What does this mean in concrete terms?

[Zagladin] Why? Perhaps you do not think so?

[Chrudinak] I agree with this, but it also means that there is a need for a new strategy -- tactic -- to be worked out against this U.S. policy of confrontation. Does such a new policy already exist, or does everything just carry on. Is the USSR counting on the chance that Reagan may change his policy?

[Zagladin] Our response to this policy is constructive and dual [as heard]. If necessary we will stiffly resist, though we will not follow our opponent's maneuvers. For example, when the Americans worked out the manufacture of their submarines equipped with Trident missiles we proposed that we should have talks on the limitation or elimination of this type of weapon.

Naturally, we received no reply whatever. As a matter of fact, the Americans' style is surprising in that they do not respond to direct proposals. I can not explain this. I merely note it as a fact. So they created their new submarines and now the President is blaming us because we created something to balance this. Yet we proposed that this should not happen. He was the one who did not agree to this. I am convinced that our strategy is not intended to automatically reply with the same steps that our opponent takes against us.

[Chrudinak] So you continue to believe in the possibility of settling the damaged relations between the USSR and the current U.S. Administration?

[Zagladin] We have always striven for that, but there is no such striving whatever on the other side. This is a fact that I am forced to note. Thank God [as heard] this does not greatly afflict us. We would like to reach a settlement with this administration, but if it does not want it that is its problem. The most important thing is that we should progress.

[Chrudinak] So can we in fact still talk about detente?

[Zagladin] Of course we can talk about it.

[Chrudinak] In what sense?

[Zagladin] What do you mean in what sense? We can expect the sober forces to once again take the upper hand. Or rather not so much that they take the upper hand, but that political movements push them into the forefront: not we but the political movements there.

[Chrudinak] Do you see any possibility now for General Secretary Yuriy Andropov to meet U.S. President Reagan? I asked you this 6 months ago, too. What is your answer now?

[Zagladin] For our part, on a number of occasions we have shown our willingness to have such a meeting. But we clearly stated that this could only be if the meeting brings some positive result. Mr Reagan is doing everything he can to prove that no result at all is possible. This is his choice, not ours.

So what shall we do? Should we ask, beg, demand, should we give proof? We will not do that. If they do not want it, we do not want it. The most important thing for us is to tread our own path, because this is the most basic factor of development. For this reason, in my opinion it is 10,000 times more important than anything that any U.S. Administration might do to fulfill what was formulated in the Prague declaration, what our parties' Central Committee secretaries discussed in Moscow in March and what will be on the agenda of our economic summit in the near future. Only long-term strategic factors have a determining significance. The rest are transitory trifles that could also happen in the future. It is not worth starting from these: only from a long-term policy.

[Chrudinak] At the same time, does this not mean autarky?

[Zagladin] Why? No, no.

[Chrudinak] That we are only turning inwards?

[Zagladin] No. There is another point at issue here. Autarky means a separation from the outside world: Have we separated from the outside world? We maintain the widest possible relations with Europe, America, Latin America, Asia and Africa. So there is no question of turning inwards. I am talking about something else. The most important thing is strengthening socialism. This is the most important thing for us. I am convinced of this.

Discusses U.S. Missile Deployment

AU071054 Vienna VOLKSSTIMME in German 7 Apr 83 p 3

[Excerpts from VOLKSSTIMME interview with Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, in Vienna on 5 April]

[Text] Question: Since the Soviet Union does not accept the interim solution, what will happen if the U.S. missiles are deployed at the end of this year?

Zagladin: First of all it must be said that Reagan's proposal does not constitute an interim solution. To deploy new American missiles in Europe is not an interim solution. That is not disarmament but further rearmament in Europe. The Soviet Union has not deployed any new missiles since last June and has even dismantled a few. The French and British are modernizing their missiles and equipping them with multiple warheads -- in other words, a constant change in the balance of power in favor of the West is taking place.

Question: There are speculations on the part of the Americans that the Soviet Union might give in at the eleventh hour.

Zagladin: There is not a single example of the Soviet Union ever having yielded to blackmail.

Question: There are conjectures that the West will not deploy the cruise missiles because they are already outdated and because the Soviet Union allegedly already has developed a defense system against them.

Zagladin: We are against all new missiles. We do not want either Pershing or cruise missiles. That is our position.

Question: In principle, if such missiles are deployed, what will happen?

Zagladin: Naturally, we will undertake something to counter the new missiles in Europe. We experienced the year 1941, when the Soviet Union was less prepared than Hitler's army. We do not want repetition of this situation. Hence we will do everything to be extremely well prepared.

If the Americans believe that they can deploy their missiles so that they can reach the Soviet Union in 5 or 6 minutes, then we will also do everything to deploy our missiles so that they, too, can reach U.S. territory in 5 or 6 minutes. The Americans believe that the battlefield must be Europe. But we are also Europeans. A war in Europe is a war which concerns everyone in Europe.

We will make every effort to make the Americans understand that they cannot keep themselves out of a world war if they start this war.

Question: Does this mean that the Soviet Union will deploy missiles in Cuba or on submarines off U.S. shores?

Zagladin: As far as Cuba is concerned, there are agreements not to deploy any missiles there, and the Soviet Union complies with agreements. There is no example of the Soviet Union's ever having violated any agreements. (Here Zagladin is alluding to the agreements between Khrushchev and Kennedy following the so-called Cuban crisis in 1962 -- VOLKSSTIMME).

Question: That leaves only submarines?

Zagladin: These are purely military questions, special questions.

Question: Assume the new U.S. missiles have been deployed. How does the USSR assess the prospects of the peace movement in this event? Is there not a danger that this movement will lose momentum?

Zagladin: Naturally we will not give up our struggle for peace and disarmament. The conditions will, of course, be worse in this event. If you want to fight a fire it is better to fight against the outbreak of the fire.

I believe that the peace movements in the West will also continue their struggle. But here, too, it holds true: The conditions are deteriorating. However, I believe that we must not focus only on this one aspect, the aspect of deployment. The positions are greatly different; the United States wants to deploy missiles and the Soviet Union wants to disarm and destroy missiles. But that is why we are negotiating. And it is necessary to negotiate.

Question: In other words, the Geneva negotiations will continue even if the missiles are deployed?

Zagladin: That is a different matter. But even if only one new missile is deployed, the conditions will change.

Question: What is your opinion of the question of deploying missiles in Asia?

Zagladin: Here I must first of all talk about a lie. The Americans at first claimed that the Soviet Union had proclaimed a moratorium, in other words, a freeze on the deployment of missiles, and then it deployed new missiles. And then Weinberger suddenly -- a week ago -- declared that the Soviet Union was deploying new missiles in Europe and Asia (!). That is, of course, a different matter. In Asia the Americans have a number of bases. They are deploying new nuclear weapons there; for example, they have installed cruise missiles on warships and F-16 bombers in Japan are also equipped with intermediate-range nuclear weapons. And we must naturally defend ourselves against this threat. As early as our 26th party congress we declared that we were prepared to negotiate about the missiles on Asian territory as well. But we never received a reply.

Question: Thus, in principle, the same situation exists in Asia that exists in Europe. There are intermediate-range missiles there, too?

Zagladin: Of course, of course.

Question: How do you assess the peace movement in the United States itself? Do you believe that it could become strong enough to prevent Reagan from running again? There are speculations that the USSR is already adjusting its policy to the next U.S. President.

Zagladin: Which president?

Question: It could be a Democrat.

Zagladin: I do not know about that. Developments in the United States in the most recent past are an example of the peculiarities of American democracy. The same applies to the present. Congress is doing one thing, the President another. It is also necessary to realize that the President was elected merely by a minority of Americans. Should new elections be held, something might change, but it does not necessarily have to change. The present situation in American democracy is such that big capital at any rate enforces what it wants.

On the other hand, the events of the recent past show that there is a discussion within the ruling circles in the United States as well as in West Europe. The Reagan administration today is doing what it wants. But there is also another trend, and not only in the Democratic but also in the Republican Party. There is not merely a discussion going on between the doves and the hawks. This discussion is a tactical one. However, another issue is at stake: How can the continuation of the capitalist system in America be ensured? The group around Reagan believes that this can be accomplished by power politics. Power politics vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, power politics vis-a-vis the West European countries, power politics vis-a-vis the developing countries. The other group is beginning to understand that an approach like Reagan's is dangerous. This Reagan policy cannot save capitalism, but it might possibly destroy everything. This is interesting, because only from discussion can new conditions emerge.

In Europe, for example, this second trend is much more pronounced than in the United States. We have not created this contradiction. We are observing developments. We do not want to play the two trends against one another. But, naturally, we are for cooperation with the men of the second trend wherever possible.

We believe that the attempts of the West to resolve all pending questions through power politics constitute an unrealistic attitude. We believe that first of all it is necessary to secure peace because without peace there will be neither capitalism nor socialism. Once peace can be ensured, we will see how things develop further. All other prospects are so dangerous that I do not even want to talk about them.

I believe the main difficulty in our relations with the United States at present is this: The Americans proceed from the viewpoint of war, we from the viewpoint of peace. Second: If we conclude an agreement, we comply with it. The Americans, however, violate treaties. Reagan, for example, is now talking about the so-called interim solution. But a few days ago he gave a different speech and proposed a star wars. However, there is a treaty with the Soviet Union precluding anything of that sort. We certainly did agree not to include space in any warfare. Who will guarantee us at all that if we conclude a new agreement with the Americans, there will not be another U.S. president in 3 or 4 years who says: This does not concern us any more, we will do something else? We believe that all agreements must be kept. If that is not valid, then there is no basis left for anything at all.

Question: Could the Austrian Government do more for peace?

Answer: We highly value Austria's activities as a neutral country, although there are a few things that are not always quite logical. But this is another matter. We believe that no country can ever do enough for peace. Naturally, I cannot give any advice to the Austrian Government or to Chancellor Kreisky, but I believe that any initiative in this direction is highly important and highly necessary, and that it will be supported by the Soviet Union.

PRAVDA HITS 'ABSURDITY' OF INTERIM OPTION

PM071525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 83 First Edition p 4

[Article by Ye. Grigoryev: "Washington's 'Theater of the Absurd' and the Demand of Reason"]

[Text] "Today all efforts must be aimed toward one goal -- preventing a nuclear catastrophe." This recent statement by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov more than accords with the peoples' sentiments and aspirations. One of their main concerns is to prevent a new spiral of the nuclear arms race in Europe and use the opportunity existing here for nuclear disarmament and the safeguarding of reliable peace.

Spring peace marches were held in early April in virtually all West European countries. They were of a particularly mass nature in Britain, the FRG, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands, which have been chosen by the Pentagon for the deployment of its new medium-range nuclear missiles. The world was convinced again that the vast majority of Europeans reject this dangerous design.

However, with the support of a number of its NATO allies the U.S. Government is persistently seeking to attain its goal. For nearly 18 months now Washington has been keeping the Geneva talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe deadlocked. Their latest round also ended without results on 29 March.

All this time the road to a mutually acceptable accord has been barred by the United States' not unknown "zero" option. This boiled down to a demand that all Soviet medium-range missiles be eliminated while at the same time leaving untouched on the U.S. and NATO side all existing medium-range weapons, not reducing them by a single missile or aircraft. It was a case of an attempt to break the existing equilibrium and ensure U.S. and NATO military superiority. Since this was a deliberately unacceptable "option" its aim could only be to deadlock the talks and then move to the implementation of that part of the NATO "dual decision" which provides for the deployment of the U.S. Pershing II missiles and cruise missiles in five West European countries.

The hopelessness and inconsistency of the U.S. "zero" option became obvious to the broadest public circles in the West. Many press organs, parties, organizations, parliamentarians and even some leaders of the West European states have expressed doubts increasingly frequently and openly as to the sincerity of U.S. conduct at the Geneva conference table.

And now, with a great fanfare of publicity, R. Reagan came up on 30 March with the so-called "interim option." It envisages "the United States considerably reducing the scale of its planned deployment of ground-launched Pershing II and cruise missiles on conditions that the Soviet Union cuts back the number of its warheads on its enhanced intermediate-range missiles to the same level on a global scale."

The absurdity and frivolousness of this so-called initiative were convincingly revealed by Comrade A.A. Gromyko at the Moscow press conference. The "interim option" is unacceptable for a number of reasons.

First, it fails to take account of the British and French medium-range nuclear weapons, including 162 missiles. Second, it fails to take account of the many hundreds of U.S. aircraft carrying nuclear weapons based in West Europe and on aircraft carriers. Third, Soviet medium-range missiles would also be subject to elimination in the Asian part of the USSR, although they have nothing to do with Europe.

As a whole, while NATO now has 50 percent advantage in Europe in terms of medium-range nuclear warheads, in the event of the "interim option's" implementation NATO would have almost 150 percent more of these warheads than the Soviet Union.

Washington and kindred spirits in NATO are now feigning "disappointment" in connection with the swift, clear and reasoned Soviet response. They would have liked to keep their new "option" afloat. They did not succeed: Indeed, could anyone seriously count on the acceptability of this approach? The proposals put forward by the United States for medium-range missiles are not a path to peace, not a path to agreement. As was authoritatively stated at the Moscow press conference, if the U.S. position is as declared by the President, there are no chances of an agreement.

As for the international public and press, they reacted to the Soviet assessment of the "interim option" not only "without surprise" (the Paris newspaper LE FIGARO) but rather with understanding. A skeptical, critical attitude toward the White House's new venture pervades many bourgeois press commentaries. THE NEW YORK TIMES calls it unsound. "The new approach," it writes, "will not be the first step on the path ridding Europe of medium-range missiles." Noting that the Pershing missiles "are a first-strike weapon," the newspaper warns: "Consequently, in advancing along the armament path, the allies will cut off the path to disarmament and thus eliminate the hope of ridding Europe of nuclear weapons."

From whichever angle you approach the U.S. line with respect to the Geneva talks, it contains neither logic nor fairness, nor arguments nor, most important, good will and the desire to reach agreement. Its aim is in the same as ever -- to "create conditions" come what may for deploying the new U.S. missiles (if not all at once then gradually) and to disrupt the existing parity in favor of the United States and NATO. So propagandist juggling and lies of the "Soviet threat" and so-called initiatives like the present "interim option" are brought into play.

But the NATO circles' hopes are vain when, in applauding the Washington "theater of the absurd," they suppose that the "interim option" will bring them capital. Glaringly obvious [as it is], this venture appears to the public as "an interim deception." It is not for nothing that Washington's "initiative," as the Western press admits, "has failed to impress the European pacifists," as has been borne out in particular by the new peace marches. The London newspaper THE OBSERVER frankly writes: "The aim of the 'interim option' is not to lead the Soviet Union to an agreement (Reagan believes that this will only happen when the U.S. missiles are deployed in Europe) but to hand the West European leaders something tangible enabling them to outmaneuver the antinuclear forces in Europe."

The illusory nature of the calculations connected with pressuring the USSR are obvious. But we cannot fail to see something else as well: The nearer the deadline for the deployment of the U.S. missiles, the more adverse an influence will be exerted by this fact on the talks, for the possibility of reaching agreement will shrink like a wild ass' skin [reference to Honore de Balzac fable in which magic wild ass' skin shrinks and loses potency with each wish it grants until final "big" wishes becomes unattainable].

And to all appearances this is what Washington wants. Indeed even raising the question of "outmaneuvering" the people and forces advocating peace of itself describes sufficiently fully the dangerous essence of the militarist Pentagon and NATO missile plan.

The danger looming over Europe is great. The gravity of the choice it now faces requires a high degree of responsibility from all those who are not indifferent to the fate of peace on our continent and throughout the world. Here political games are inappropriate.

"The question of whether arms control talks still have any chance is being decided in Geneva," the well-known German figure E. Bahr writes in the weekly VORWAERTS. "That is why the result is important, that is why it is dangerous to insist on an 'interim solution,' which is another term for the initiation of deployment.... He who is now seeking an 'interim solution' is reluctant to press for a possible result. If there is no result, the talks will be continued. But why initiate deployment here? The 'dual' decision sets no deadlines," E. Bahr stresses. "The decision was: a result or the continuation of talks without deployment. All this should be an alternative."

If the new U.S. missiles are deployed, Princeton University Professor (P. Almen) warns in FOREIGN POLICY magazine, "there are very substantial ground for believing" that "West Europe will be a far more dangerous place than if the West agrees with the principle contained in the proposal which Yu.V. Andropov put forward in December 1982."

Yes, that is so. Understandably, with the growth of the danger of war generated by the implementation of the U.S.-NATO plan, the USSR could not remain indifferent. It would be obliged to give a timely and effective response. But that would not be our choice. The Soviet Union favors a different path.

The international public is well aware of how much the Soviet Union has done and is doing for peace in Europe, including the attainment of a mutually acceptable Soviet-U.S. accord in Geneva. To create a favorable atmosphere and to facilitate the talks' success our country has taken a number of major steps. The USSR has unilaterally declared a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles in the European part of the country and it is true to its word.

The Soviet Union's proposal to reach agreement on renouncing all types of nuclear weapons intended to hit targets in Europe -- both medium-range and tactical -- contains a radical solution. This would be a real "zero option" but the West has proved unprepared for this decision. Another USSR proposal, if it is implemented, would make it possible to reduce by a factor of three the medium-range weapons on each side.

Our country is prepared to set about retaining in Europe only a number of its own missiles equal to the number possessed by Britain and France -- and not a single one more. This means that hundreds of missiles would be reduced, including several dozen of the most sophisticated, which the West calls SS-20 missiles. The medium-range aircraft carrying the weapons would also be reduced to equal ceilings on both sides, both NATO and the USSR.

In that event a total of over 1,300 medium-range weapons would be reduced. After that the number of Soviet medium-range missile launchers in the European part of the country and the total number of warheads on them would be less than in 1976. That is before the Soviet Union updated its medium-range missiles.

The Soviet program proceeds wholly from the principle of parity and equal security. It offers a honest compromise in the interests of peace. Our proposals are reflected in the draft for a corresponding treaty submitted in Geneva. They are a good businesslike basis for reaching an agreement under which the balance in medium-range armaments would be retained but at a considerably lower level than now. There is no need to prove how the cause of peace would benefit.

In advancing constructive new proposals aimed at the practical solution of problems of nuclear arms limitation in Europe, Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said: "We urge our partners to embark on this clear and just accord and to take this opportunity while it is there."

For this realism and common sense are needed, as is consideration of both sides' legitimate interests and observance of the principle of parity and equal security. As before it is only up to the West, only up to the United States, to speak and act.

COMMENTATOR CONTRASTS U.S., USSR ARMS PROPOSALS

LD071656 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0445 GMT 7 Apr 83

[International affairs journalist Nikolay Shishlin commentary]

[Text] You are, comrades, familiar of course with Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's press conference devoted to the key problems of today's international life, and primarily to the situation that is forming concerning medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. The situation really is such that the Reagan administration, which has for a long time been popularizing the idea of a so-called zero option -- a zero, incidentally, for the Soviet Union -- has moved away from this idea, on the face of it, at any rate, now the U.S. President and those around him are popularizing a new idea, the idea of an interim solution. But one cannot decipher either the possible levels of nuclear weapons or any quantitative parameters being defined: Meanwhile, certain conditions are formulated for the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union is asked not to take British and French medium-range nuclear weapons into account when problems of curtailing medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe are discussed. The Soviet Union is asked to close its eyes to U.S. aircraft capable of carrying nuclear missile weaponry, situated in West Europe or on aircraft carriers in the waters adjacent to the Continent of Europe. And the Soviet Union is also asked to (?permit) a levelling between U.S. nuclear forces in Europe and all of its own medium-range nuclear weapons: Meanwhile, of course, the United States does not make this demand on itself. The United States' approach, in essence, again looks like a return to the same old zero option, a zero from the point of view of practical actions aimed at curtailing the arms race for the United States.

The NATO Council and the United States' partners are now hastening to make wordy statements that they are practically enraptured by Washington's new ideas, although it is visible to the unaided eye that these so-called new ideas are a rehash of the old ones. By the way, Japan is also hastening to state solidarity with the U.S. ideas concerning the so-called interim solution. It seems that this solution, quite simply, leads to practical actions by the United States to deploy its medium-range nuclear weapons on the territory of a number of West European states.

It is not fortuitous that the United States, flirting coquetting with the idea of disarmament, and at the same time not offering the Soviet Union anything practical, is at the same time stepping up the arms race in the most serious way.

This concerns a number of strategic weapons, and it concerns all the most important components of modern armed forces that the United States has its disposal. I think it should be recalled that the latest concepts expressed by President Reagan were accompanied by such a scheme [ideyka] as one of a new U.S. strategic defensive concept which, the President thinks, should lead, somewhere on the threshold of the next millenium, to the United States -- look again, and this includes their allies as well -- being protected from space against any possibility of a strike in response to aggressive actions by the United States and NATO.

In general, as far as this defensive concept is concerned, it is so far all in the air, as they say, but the chief elements are real and consist in the fact the United States on the one hand is continuing to press on with the arms race, giving it a truly all-embracing character, and on the other hand it is trying to put the brakes on the dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, and is in essence blocking all talks concerning disarmament problems.

This policy of hardness, of increasing tension, and of stepping up confrontation with the socialist world is being repaid by fairly serious difficulties in the development of world economic cooperation. I believe that artificial hindrances on the path of development of world economic cooperation in no way help to overcome the crisis phenomena that are characteristics both of the state of the U.S. economy and the economies of its allies. (?It does not provide any) satisfaction in the perspective of the possibilities and the use of opportunities for resolving the global problems facing mankind; mankind must resolve these problems, however it cannot do so by the efforts of one country taken separately, only through peaceful cooperation, through broad, truly businesslike cooperation between different states, which, by the way, is what the Soviet Union calls for. One cannot fail to agree with Kennan, well-known U.S. political figure and a major diplomat in his time, who considers that the world is today paying extremely dear for the false assertion by Washington today about the allegedly aggressive intentions existing in Soviet foreign policy.

Where are we now situated, comrades, in connection with this complicated turn of events that came about at the end of March and beginning of April? First, on 17 May we can expect the resumption of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on curtailing medium-range nuclear weapons. The resumption of the talks is in itself a good thing, but it does not guarantee success, all the more since the position is thus: The Soviet Union, as is known, has supported a true zero option, and this position is maintained; that is, the Soviet Union considers that it would be possible to move toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, both medium-range ones in Europe and tactical weapons. The United States rejects this proposal of ours. The Soviet Union has another position too, which has been stressed repeatedly in the most responsible, most authoritative Soviet statements, namely -- the Soviet Union is in favor of a sharp reduction of the levels of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, including, of course, not only missiles, but also other carriers of nuclear weapons. However, it seems that this is not to Washington's liking today either. Incidentally, in his latest speeches U.S. President Reagan did not describe any quantitative characteristics of the interim solution he speaks of, but the U.S. press, no doubt not without the consent of the White House, is naming figures of the order of 100 medium-range missiles for the United States, and it is known, for example, that as far as the Pershings are concerned, the United States reckons to deploy 108 of them. This shows once again that the U.S. position is calculated only with the United States' own imperial interest in mind, and that they are by no means ready to take into account the interests of international security, and the interests of the security of the Soviet Union and the socialist world; or, incidentally, the security interests of their own partners.

If we are describing our position and can say that the Soviet Union is not only putting forward constructive ideas but is also in favor of continuing the dialogue, then it turns out that the United States is in favor not so much of dialogue as of talking about a dialogue, because a dialogue is a dialogue when it leads to specific, tangible results. It seems to me that at the moment, as never in the past, future decisions depend to a large extent not only on the positions of the direct participants in the talks, but that decisions will be adopted taking into account all the European states, taking their points of view and their interests into account. The voice of the European socialist countries and the voice of the European bourgeois states, can, of course, sound out quite weightily. All the same, West Europe's point of view can be seen not only in the positions taken by Thatcher or other leaders but can also be seen in the mass antinuclear and antimissile demonstrations that are sweeping virtually all the European bourgeois countries this spring, and especially those countries whose territory, as it happens, they want to turn into a firing range for the deployment of U.S. missiles.

Returning now to Reagan's speech in Los Angeles, I believe that the very idea put forward by Reagan is addressed not to the Soviet Union, because it is simply senseless to address such unrealistic proposals to the Soviet Union. This idea is addressed to West Europe, and is intended to help those who support the United States to deal with their own public opinion. Thus the aim that was set was not practical but political, a propaganda one. When the matter concerns problems as serious as the fate of Europe, the fate of universal peace, then the propaganda approach, of course, will prove to be unsound.

PRAVDA REBUTS PENTAGON'S 'SOVIET MILITARY POWER'

PM081115 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 83 First Edition pp 4-5

[Editorial article: "Washington in a Militarist Fever"]

[Text] Bellicose passions are literally seething in Washington. Every day, and sometimes several times a day, speeches are made on the need for military preparations, which have already taken on an unprecedented scope. The Pentagon's military spending has reached record levels, and the expenditure planned for the next 5 years is really fantastic:

1984 -- \$273 billion
1985 -- \$323 billion
1986 -- \$357 billion
1987 -- \$388 billion
1988 -- \$425 billion

It is becoming clear that U.S. leading circles have openly set a course of kindling military hysteria and whipping up an unprecedented arms race -- a course leading to the intensification of the danger of war. What Washington is doing now pursues the main goal of trying to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union, dealing with the socialist countries from a position of strength and generally trying to impose its will on the world. The hegemonists across the ocean base their calculations on the principle that, if they succeed in achieving that goal through nuclear blackmail, they will be satisfied with that; if not, they are prepared to embark on the path of direct armed adventures and even war. They see the attainment of decisive military superiority, as an opportunity to secure victory in such a war. Such crazy plans are scarcely concealed.

But it is becoming difficult to simply ignore the growing misgivings of the broad masses at the openly militarist course, as they come out increasingly persistently against military preparations. Even in the United States itself there has been a sharp increase in feelings of alarm at the danger of nuclear catastrophe. This is expressed in the broad antiwar movement and in actions for a nuclear arms freeze and cuts in excessive military spending. And Washington cannot avoid reckoning with this. So the U.S. Administration, including President R. Reagan himself, is from time to time forced to engage in demagogic expatiations on its desire for peace. And in order to somehow justify their true line, they resort to insistent assertions that the USSR is pushing the United States onto the path of military preparations. Under cover of this false propaganda they hope to create in the public a growing sense of the danger of war allegedly emanating from the Soviet Union and seek to force the peoples of the United States and Western Europe to agree to a vast increase in military spending.

The most vivid examples of speculation on the "Soviet military threat" myth are the U.S. President's 23 March speech and the recently concocted second edition of the Pentagon's pamphlet "Soviet Military Power." They are as alike as two peas in a pod. Both contain mountains of falsehoods and fabrications on Soviet military policy, deliberately distort the true correlation of military forces between the USSR and the United States and, of course, keep quiet about Washington's dangerous designs.

As REUTER noted, the White House has now adopted a strategy which amounts to bombarding the public with evidence of "Soviet military superiority" and convincing the Congress that a vote against Reagan's military budget could have unfavorable political consequences.

The aforementioned Pentagon pamphlet is a model of such "evidence."

The Washington administration's leaders make no secret of the fact that the publication's purposed is to prove that "the USSR seeks to achieve military superiority in all spheres" and is preparing for a protracted nuclear war in the hope of securing victory. Meanwhile the United States, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger asserts, is "struggling for peace," but for that purpose it must allegedly eliminate its military laggardness in relation to the USSR, "correct the disturbed strategic balance" and increase military spending. Leaving the defense secretary's "love of peace" on one side for the moment, let us turn our attention to what he is calling for. It is hardly a coincidence that the purpose of the President's 23 March speech also amounts to saying that the United States must arm itself intensively and become the dominant military power.

To "substantiate" this main creed, the pamphlet gives a tendentious picture of questions of the building of the USSR Armed Forces, juggles with facts about the correlation of forces and uses distorting prisms in assessing the sides' military spending. In short, everything is designed not simply to mislead people, but to frighten them. To that end they stop at nothing.

The pamphlet's authors, using color pictures and all kinds of charts and diagrams to depict the "formidable Soviet military preparations," compare only those individual indicators relating to the Soviet and U.S. military forces which suit them, distorting the general picture of the correlation of armaments and troop numbers of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The estimate of the numbers of troops and armaments is deliberately made without taking account of the fact that the USSR has to oppose not only the United States but also the other NATO countries and that it is forced to pursue certain defensive measures on other salients too. The pamphlet ignores all this and presents it all exclusively in the form of confrontation between the USSR and the United States. But with this approach the calculations cited for comparison are based on a deception. They have "forgotten" to include more than 40 percent of the numerical strength of U.S. Armed Forces and armaments (formations of the National Guard and the permanent reserve). Similar formations in the USSR are taken into account.

The false assertions that the USSR's defense spending exceeds U.S. appropriations for military purposes are again repeated. This is how the forgery is done: They take our annual GNP and convert it from rubles into dollars. They then establish what it would cost to maintain the Soviet Armed Forces at American prices. The mythical Soviet military budget thus arrived at is then compared with the total GNP. The result -- 12-14 percent. And at the same time, the conclusion is that the Pentagon's budget is inadequate. You can imagine what absurd results would be obtained if such manipulations were used in relation to other calculations based on our economic needs. Let us note in passing that recently even such unobjective witnesses as specialists from the U.S. CIA were forced to admit that such estimates of Soviet defense spending are exaggerated several times over.

The American calculations also mask another deception in connection with the deliberate understatement of U.S. military spending. For instance, many tens of billions of dollars which were spent on the Vietnam war are "dropped" from the estimate of U.S. military spending in past years, on the pretext that they were not intended for confrontation with the USSR. So it is as though they had never reached the U.S. war machine at all.

Stupid, Yes. But simple.

The booklet says much about strategic arms, and in particular about the danger to the United States of the "ultrapowerful," "ultranew" Soviet Typhoon class missile submarine. Here they slyly insinuate the idea that the United States will obtain the allegedly equivalent Trident II American missile system only in the nineties, until which time the Americans will be practically unarmed. But this is once again a trick, since it is necessary to conceal the fact that the United States already has modern missile-carrying submarines of the Ohio class in its armory, armed with the powerful new Trident I ballistic missiles. Finally, it should be recalled that it was the Soviet Union which repeatedly proposed a ban on the creation of the U.S. Trident maritime missile system and the corresponding Soviet system. That proposal was not accepted. As a result the Ohio with Trident I missiles appeared in the United States, and the Typhoon in our country.

Later the USSR proposed that agreement be reached on limiting the numbers of these submarines and banning the modernization of existing ballistic missiles and the creation of new ones for deployment on these ships. But that proposal was rejected too. That is the truth of the matter. But it is out of favor with the Pentagon's scribblers.

C. Weinberger's expatiations on the new Soviet ICBM, the new heavy bomber and our Typhoon submarine are intended for outright deception. After all, it is well known that the development of the MX missile has been under way since 1973 in the United States, the modern B-1 American heavy bomber was created in 1975, and an Ohio missile submarine was launched in 1981. Merely mentioning these dates put everything in its place, which is to say: The creation of the new Soviet strategic facilities was, even in its timing, the USSR's response to the American militarists' attempt to achieve superiority in the strategic arms sphere.

The compilers of the pamphlet make another "sensational revelation." Noting that the USSR is developing long-range cruise missiles, they try to make out that the Soviet Union is allegedly thereby opening a new channel in the arms race, neither more or less. Well, as the saying goes, murder will out. The point is that two squadrons of American B-52 heavy bombers are already armed with such missiles. And in all, the Pentagon's programs provide for the creation of more than 12,000 cruise missiles using all types of basing. We were forced to reply to this challenge from the American side too: our own long-range cruise missile to reply to the American long-range cruise missile.

However, it must be recalled that the USSR has for many years now sought a ban on long-range cruise missiles in general as a type of weapon, in the course of strategic arms limitation talks with the United States. The USSR is proposing this even now at the START talks and the talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe. Who is against it? The United States.

If you listen to C. Weinberger, it transpires that U.S. missiles are all obsolete and vulnerable, and "America's security is in jeopardy." In reality the Minutemen III and Poseidon III strategic ballistic missiles were adopted in the seventies, and Trident I in the early eighties. Moreover the Pentagon prefers not to advertise the fact that in terms of the total number of nuclear warheads capable of being dispatched in one launch (flight) by all the components of the American "triad," the United States has superiority over the USSR. When Weinberger was asked directly about this, he could come up with nothing better than to state that nuclear warheads are...not a very "important indicator," and that both sides now have an "equal" quantity of them. But that is a lie: The U.S. strategic nuclear forces have far more nuclear warheads, as is clearly visible from the graph. [PRAVDA here publishes a sketch graph showing the USSR's "number of warheads" as being between 2,000 and about 2,500 from 1971 through 1977, then rising to around 7,000 in 1981, while U.S. warheads are shown as rising steadily from about 5,000 in 1971 to over 10,000 in 1981.]

The pamphlet's attempt to understate the number of American B-52 strategic bombers by more than 300 is absolute eyewash. It is asserted that the United States now has only 241 B-52 planes, while the figure cited in the SALT II treaty, signed by the U.S. President, is 574. And there has been no withdrawal of these planes from the U.S. arsenals since that time. On the contrary, they are being modernized and equipped with modern long-range cruise missiles. But the pamphlet does not breathe a word, as the saying goes, about this.

Instead, the pamphlet repeats the already hackneyed nonsense whereby the Soviet medium bomber known in the West as the Backfire (its characteristic were handed over to the American side back in 1979 at the strategic arms limitation talks) is labeled an "innovation in today's strategic bomber aviation."

The pamphlet's authors would also like to present the Soviet Union's achievements in the exploration and exploitation of outer space for peaceful purposes to the whole world as evidence of "the Russians' desire for military superiority in space." Juggling with figures about the number of launches and the total payload put in space, the Pentagon passes over in silence the most important thing -- the fact that the number of America artificial earth satellites permanently in space is invariably 50-100 percent more than the number of Soviet satellite. And it is well known that this is done above all for military purposes. The United States has elaborated and is implementing a very extensive program for the militarization of space. Its main salients are enshrined in a special presidential directive. They were also reaffirmed in a new Pentagon directive signed by Weinberger a week after the pamphlet was published. A special space command has been set up to prepare for war in space. The main purpose of the implementation of the U.S. military space policy is to create the conditions for the attainment of dominance in space using system designed to make strikes against land, sea, air and space targets.

The Soviet Union seeks to make space a sphere of peaceful cooperation. The Soviet proposal submitted to the United Nations to ban the deployment of weapons of any kind in space has been on the negotiating table at the Disarmament Committee for more than a year now. Because of U.S. opposition, however, practical work on this problem has not begun. And whatever excuses the American side makes, there is but one real reason here -- Washington is interested in seeing that there is no complete system of international treaties which would erect an obstacle in the path of the militarization of space and in the path of the Pentagon's very dangerous plans.

The brochure provides a distorted picture when assessing the correlation of conventional armed forces. It all but speaks, in particular, of the Soviet Navy's superiority over the American Navy. Of course, in recent years the USSR has improved the technical equipment and the combat might of its Navy. At the same time, has the United States turned its warships into pleasure yachts and not developed its Navy or intensively built up its combat potential? The following official comparative data give us an idea of the size of the navies and their correlation in terms of basic indicators:

	USSR	United States	Ratio
Nuclear-powered submarines	180	123	1.4:1
Surface ships of main classes	112	143	1:1.3
Total tonnage of warships (million tons)	2.6	4.5	1:1.7

All these facts are known in the United States. But the point is that the White House does not allow the idea that the USSR Navy will suddenly compare with the U.S. Navy. It was not for nothing that on 23 March the President bluntly declared that the United States "must have superior naval forces." It could not be put more frankly.

They seek to intimidate the Western reader by saying that in 1981 the USSR had two Kiev-class aircraft carriers, while now it has three such aircraft carriers and the construction of a fourth has begun. One could ask, however; Is the USSR upsetting some equilibrium and exceeding its defense requirements by building aircraft-carrying ships? Such a question cannot arise if you recall that the U.S. Navy already incorporates 21 aircraft carriers and aircraft-carrying ships. In addition, the U.S. naval development program for 1983-1987 provides for the building of new Nimitz-class nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. It is proposed to incorporate two such aircraft carriers in the fighting strength by 1987. More than 520 aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons and hitting targets on USSR territory are now based on U.S. aircraft carriers. The brochure says nothing about this. For the aggressive thrust of the development of the American Navy and the U.S. desire to rule the world ocean and realize "America's leading role in the world" would immediately be clear.

Aimed at ill-formed people, the brochure provides clearly understated data on NATO's conventional armed forces. Once again in an attempt to prove the Warsaw Pact's military superiority.

The real picture is like this; The NATO bloc has the advantage in terms of total personnel strength, the number of combat-ready divisions and antitank facilities and a roughly equal quantity of artillery and armored hardware. NATO lags somewhat behind only with regard to the number of tactical aircraft. On the whole, there is approximate equality in terms of conventional arms.

Finally, a comprehensive analysis is necessary when comparing conventional arms. But the brochure's authors avoid this. They deliberately disregard the sides' mobilization resources, including human resources, as well as combat-ready reserve formations; France's Armed Forces are entirely discounted; the troops remaining subordinate to the NATO countries' national commands are not shown; stored stocks of arms and hardware are not taken into account; since it is otherwise impossible to obtain an advantageous correlation, the data on the Warsaw Pact armed forces are arbitrarily overstated.

By using these methods it is, of course, possible to "prove" anything you like, except one thing -- it is impossible to prove that black is white and that truth and lies are one and the same thing. But it is precisely this that the Pentagon is endeavoring to prove.

The allegation contained in the brochure that Soviet troops in Afghanistan use chemical weapons is not simply a malicious fabrication but a direct provocation. This is known to have been refuted both by a group of UN experts and by research by British and Australian scientists. Washington persists, however. It needed a shameless lie in order to try to make people forget the barbarous crimes committed by the American military in Vietnam and to camouflage the new multibillion dollar program for the chemical rearming of the U.S. Army.

The brochure contains the crudest distortions relating to Soviet foreign policy. The Pentagon deceivers seek to prove what cannot be proved: the U.S. love of peace and Soviet expansionism. Even C. Weinberger, under whose leadership various nuclear war options are being formulated and ideas for winning it are being cherished, is now trying to depict himself as a "peacemaker." He hypocritically pontificates: "...Our (that is, the U.S.) strategy is one of deterring war," or has it perhaps been forgotten that only quite recently he maintained in every speech that "the path to peace is marked by preparation for war"? No, it has not been forgotten. And the secretary is the same one.

What "Soviet expansionism" does the United States dare to expatiate on when it has many hundreds of military bases scattered throughout the world, thousands of miles from American territory? The USSR has no such bases. It is not the USSR but the United States that has created a 200,000-strong rapid deployment gendarme corps designed to interfere at any moment in internal events in sovereign states which Washington considers a threat to its "vital interests." There is not a word about this in the Pentagon brochure. Just as it does not mention many other facts, like, for example, the ones published recently by a committee of the Democratic Party faction in the U.S. Senate. This committee's report bluntly names another U.S. military record -- in 1982 alone the United States sent overseas weapons and military hardware worth \$21.5 billion. Let the Pentagon deny it!

What "love of peace" can be claimed by people who strive for world domination by any means, including preparations to unleash nuclear war, who have proclaimed a "crusade" against the USSR and the other socialist countries and who have set themselves the aim of kindling hatred and enmity toward other peoples? Is it possible to believe in the "love of peace" of those who consider nuclear war admissible and "moral," who refuse to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and who have adopted a policy of undermining the Soviet-American treaties and agreements in the arms limitation sphere? Does President Reagan display love of peace when he declares that the United States has "the real possibility of a technological breakthrough in the sphere of creating new types of weapons" and, by utilizing this, will try to get one-sided concessions from the USSR at the talks on nuclear arms limitation? As Yu.V. Andropov has emphasized, "the present U.S. Administration is continuing to travel an extremely dangerous path.... Washington's actions threaten the whole world."

The second edition of the Pentagon's big lie, as well as President Reagan's 23 March speech, is aimed at fueling tension in the world and further whipping up the arms race. The White House is not concerned about strengthening international security and reinforcing stability. Fanning the myth of the "Soviet military threat," it is pursuing the policy of achieving military superiority and establishing American supremacy over other countries. This is also the root of Washington's actions to block the disarmament talks, to undermine the existing accords in this sphere and to create an atmosphere of pathological enmity toward the USSR.

Broad public circles will no doubt be able to understand correctly this new unscrupulous concoction prepared in Washington's propaganda kitchen. The manufacturers of all sorts of fairytales cannot conceal their dangerous plans for the preparation of war by deceiving people. Nor will they succeed in halting the growing mass movement throughout the world aimed at thwarting these plans. "The peoples are now emerging into the forefront of history as never before," Yu. V. Andropov points out. "They have acquired the right to a voice which no one can stifle. By means of energetic and purposeful actions they are capable of removing the threat of nuclear war and safeguarding peace and, thus, life on our planet. And the CPSU and the Soviet state will do everything to ensure that this happens."

TASS REVIEWS KOMMUNIST ARTICLE ON ARMS RACE

LD080443 Moscow TASS in English 2043 GMT 7 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS -- The steady build-up and modernization in the course of several decades of U.S. strategic and other armaments, the new "strategic program" put forward recently by Reagan, Washington's striving to deploy medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe at all costs -- all this, together with many other facts, irrefutably shows that the U.S. has been and continues to be the instigator of the arms race. This is pointed out in the article devoted to the Soviet program of curbing the arms race, which is published in the fifth issue of the journal "KOMMUNIST". The fact that Washington rejected one after another or left without a constructive response all the Soviet proposals aimed to limit armaments and to achieve disarmament is a weighty argument in favour of this statement. It is also worth recalling that the U.S. refuses to follow the example of the Soviet Union and to pledge a no-first use of nuclear weapons. It has refused to ratify the SALT-2 treaty and does not express any desire to resume talks on complete banning of nuclear tests and to conclude an agreement on non-deployment in outer space of any kind of weapons. This list could be made much longer.

The journal -- the publication of the CPSU Central Committee -- points out that the Western countries do not have the right to remain aloof. The role of popularizers of the unconstructive and one-sided stand of Washington is not very becoming to them either. They can, and this is their duty, to resolutely come out in favour of the just solution of the problem of limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments, and, consequently, in favour of peace in the European Continent and all over the world. And they should not be discouraged by not infrequent allegations that to act like this is to undermine solidarity with the U.S. and the unity of NATO, and to play into the hands of the Soviet Union. The purpose of these unseemly statements is to divert attention from the egoistic and futile character of the tactic of the Reagan administration at the Geneva talks on nuclear armaments. Those countries which seem ready to welcome U.S. missiles and virtually to put themselves in the position of nuclear hostages of Washington, should think over the possible consequences of this policy, KOMMUNIST writes.

GRISHIN WELCOMES GROMYKO ON RETURN FROM PRAGUE

PM111055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 83 First Edition p 4

[Text] Moscow, April 7 -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, returned to Moscow from Prague today. In Czechoslovakia he took part in the meeting of the Foreign Ministers Committee of Warsaw Treaty member-states.

At the airport Andrey Gromyko was welcomed by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee Viktor Grishin, S.V. Chervonenko, chief of a CPSU Central Committee section, and other officials.

The welcoming party included Ambassador of Czechoslovakia in the USSR Cestmir Lovetinsky.

CEMA SESSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION HELD

PM060717 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Agreement Extended"]

[Text] Berlin, 31 Mar -- The main directions of the CEMA countries' cooperation in the sphere of environmental protection for the period 1986-90 and the question of extending the validity of the relevant CEMA agreement were examined at a routine session of the CEMA Council for Questions of Environmental Protection which was held 29-30 March in the city of Neubrandenburg. Delegations from the CEMA countries and also Yugoslavia participated.

As the protocol for the session points out, the CEMA countries will continue to focus efforts on resolving tasks of rationally utilizing and protecting natural resources, introducing into production processes with the least amount of waste, and recycling industrial waste in the national economy with a view to facilitating people's working and living conditions. The council's joint working plan for 1983-84 was also approved.

Approximately 400 scientific research organizations in the CEMA countries, whose activity is coordinated by the council, are currently involved in realizing tasks and projects associated with nature conservation.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD082009 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 8 Apr 83

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Yevgeniy Kachanov, all-union radio foreign political commentator; Gennadiy Arkadyevich Shishkin, TASS political observer; Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev, international affairs journalist; and Konstantin Ivanovich Semenov, historian]

U.S. 'Dangerous' Arms Policy

[Excerpts] [Kachanov] We continue to receive many letters from people who express serious alarm over Washington's dangerous policy and the arms race being conducted by it. I shall mention just a few of these letters. They are from (Lev Nalimanovich Magomedov) from the Dagestan ASSR, (Kruptsov) from Vologda Oblast, (Aleksina Petrovna Usova) from the town of Yurga in Kemerovo Oblast, (Grigoriy Danilovich Tupyanskiy) from the workers settlement of (Rayshovat) in Voronezh Oblast, (Grigoriy Gavrilovich Mokriy) from the village of Sredniy Rashkhovets in Kirov Oblast. We showed these letters, the common theme of which is, basically, the need for urgent and immediate measures to save mankind from the threat of nuclear war, to Gennadiy Arkadyevich Shishkin, TASS political observer, who is taking part in our program.

[Shishkin] This is precisely why there has been such an immense reaction throughout the world to the answers by Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to questions from a PRAVDA correspondent and the press conference held by Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR foreign minister. All sensible people regarded these important pronouncements by Soviet leaders as yet another graphic demonstration of the fact that the Soviet Union is countering the insane course of the Reagan administration with its own policy, a policy of peace and friendship between the peoples, a policy of noninterference in the internal affairs of other states, a policy aimed at detente.

[Kachanov] Gennadiy Arkadyevich, is it possible to single out the principal, the decisive issue, from the entire range of tasks now facing mankind in solving the problems of strengthening international security?

[Shishkin] The problem of European security is unquestionably such an issue at the present time. For a whole number of reasons the question how to avoid a new round in the nuclear missile armaments race in Europe has become crucially important now. Throughout modern history the state of affairs in Europe has been decisive in determining the future not only of the peoples of this continent but the fate of the entire world. One should not forget that there has been unending number of small and big wars, including two world wars, in the history of the European Continent. Admittedly, Europe has been living in peace for almost 38 years now. But this has been an armed peace. Huge stocks of nuclear and conventional weapons are concentrated on the territory of European countries.

Europe, which has found itself right at the center of the confrontation between two systems, has come up against an unprecedented threat. This threat increased still further when Washington foisted on its NATO partners the so-called dual decision, according to which the United States intends to deploy 572 new U.S. nuclear missiles in the FRG, Britain, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands, beginning in December 1983, if agreement has not been reached at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on medium-range nuclear weapons by that time.

[Kachanov] But it is clear, is it not, Gennadiy Arkadyevich, that there is limited time available in which to solve the problems of disarmament and security. What's more, it is getting less. After all, December is not far off and the Geneva talks have not resulted in anything.

[Shishkin] From the very beginning the United States has behaved in a manner intended to prevent them from leading to anything so that the United States could use this as a pretext to deploy its missiles in Western Europe. It is not for nothing that the West German newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU stresses that the U.S. Department of Defense does not tire of repeating that the decision on the deployment of new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles on the territory of Western Europe is final and not subject to revocation, regardless of the outcome of the Geneva talks.

[Kachanov] Let us recall that the Soviet Union has put forward a true zero option by proposing the conclusion of an agreement on renouncing all types of nuclear weapons designed to hit targets in Europe, both medium-range ones and tactical ones. When the West did not respond to this initiative, we proposed another option. We proposed that medium-range armaments in Europe be reduced to less than one-third. Is that not the case?

[Shishkin] The United States also brushed off this proposal. However, as even THE WASHINGTON POST was forced to admit, the bellicose actions of the Reagan administration have given birth to a broad peace movement in the United States and Europe. Hence, THE WASHINGTON POST notes, the administration is now faced head on with the problem of how to silence the defenders of peace.

The White House tried to achieve this by putting forward its so-called zero option. The basic aim of this is to bring about the destruction of all the Soviet Union's missiles while leaving U.S. and NATO nuclear weapons delivery systems in Europe completely untouched. In practice this would mean the unilateral disarmament of our country.

When it received the rebuff it deserved and realized that this attempt had been completely exposed and discredited in the eyes of world public opinion, the Reagan administration put forward the so-called interim option. U.S. propaganda has tried very hard to present this move by Washington as a gesture of good will and a concession to the Soviet Union. THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, for example, that White House representatives were describing the interim option as a far-reaching proposal by the West which had been put forward because of pressure from NATO member governments which in turn were under pressure from antinuclear movements in their countries.

Can it be that in proposing its interim option Washington was actually making a concession to the participants in antiwar demonstrations? Of course not. From the very start the interim option was conceived as a propaganda maneuver intended to deceive world public opinion. By means of this option Washington hopes to demonstrate the United States's imaginary flexibility at the talks to its NATO allies and to accuse the Soviet Union, which cannot agree and never will agree to proposals upsetting the military and strategic parity and the principle of equal security, of being unyielding. It is also completely obvious that the aim of the interim option, as well as the zero option, is to make it possible at all costs to begin deploying the new U.S. missiles in Western Europe.

At his press conference in Moscow Comrade Gromyko persuasively showed why the so-called interim option is unacceptable not just to the Soviet Union but to all who cherish the cause of peace and of strengthening security. This option is unacceptable because in the first place it does not take account of British and French medium-range nuclear systems, including 162 missiles.

In the second place it does not take account of the many hundreds of U.S. aircraft carrying nuclear weapons which are based in Western Europe and on aircraft carriers. In the third place Soviet medium-range missiles in the Asian USSR would be subject to elimination, although they have nothing to do with Europe whatsoever.

In general NATO now has a 50 percent advantage in medium-range nuclear warheads in Europe. But if the interim option were to be implemented, NATO would have almost 150 percent more warheads of this kind than the Soviet Union. No intelligent person can fail to agree with Comrade Gromyko's principled and firm assessment of Reagan's interim option. As we know, on the pages of THE NEW YORK TIMES (Epstein), the U.S. expert on nuclear weapons, described the zero option as an unsound idea and the interim option as inadequate and unattainable.

[Kachanov] But it is not only specialists and public opinion but also certain leaders of West European states who are opposed to this dangerous policy of Washington's.

[Shishkin] Danish Prime Minister Jorgensen noted that opposition to the deployment of nuclear weapons is so strong among the people of the Western countries that President Reagan himself will inevitably come against it soon. The peoples want peace and not terrible new armaments, he stressed. In my view, it is not only shameful but also fraught with catastrophe for us in Western Europe to blindly follow Reagan's path.

As far as the Reagan administration is concerned, by all accounts Washington continues to nurture the hope that the United States will get its way by hook or by crook. In its review of official and semiofficial U.S. reactions THE NEW YORK TIMES quotes a statement made by Professor (Ulam) of Harvard University who often acts as a consultant to the State Department. He declared that: "If we begin deploying the missiles in Europe in December, the Soviets will start negotiating properly". Such views, THE NEW YORK TIMES adds, are current in State Department and CIA circles.

There are also people in the Pentagon and the White House who go even further and assert that the hard line taken by President Reagan is the only way of doing business with the enemy [protivnik]. Comrade Gromyko gave these unrealistic calculations the answer they deserved. He declared: The claim that the more pressure put on the Soviet Union, the more chance there is of an agreement, is also completely unserious. To a certain extent, perhaps, it can be explained by lack of knowledge about the Soviet Union, about our character, if you like. The Soviet Union is absolutely determined to do all it can to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. The existing military and strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States is a reliable guarantee of peace. It is this parity which has deprived the United States of the capacity to blackmail the Soviet Union and other countries of the world with the nuclear threat. Because they are perfectly aware of this, those who cherish the interests of peace support the Soviet Union's endeavors to preserve this parity.

U.S. Policy Toward Spain

Today we are going to continue our discussion about Spain with international affairs journalist Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev, and we shall reply to a letter from our listener (Uliyskiy) from the Pobeda Kolkhoz in Tajikistan. He asks us to talk about U.S. policy toward the present Spanish Government.

[Kovalev] It can be summed up in a few words in the following way, Yevgeniy Viktorovich. Washington intends to continue resolutely and by any means to hinder Spain from drawing back from plans worked out by the Pentagon to defend the West.

The U.S. Administration is using all the means available to it in order to force the Socialist government in Spain to act from a position of pragmatism, that is, to heed the pressure which the White House, the State Department and the Pentagon are incessantly bringing to bear on Madrid. It is apparent that Washington is primarily interested in maintaining its military bases on Spanish territory. In addition, the Americans are doing everything they can to force the Spaniards to remain in NATO.

There is much being written in the foreign press at present about Spain and about the prospects for its government's policies on the international scene. But what are these prospects in reality? I shall permit myself a quote from the Madrid magazine CAMBIO-16, which a few days ago quoted the opinion of an eminent Spanish academic lecturing at U.S. universities. On the subject of Spanish-U.S. relations in particular, he used the following words: Washington possesses a sufficiently powerful weapon to persuade Felipe Gonzalez not to do anything silly. To do anything silly in the jargon means to endanger the United States's strategic interests in Spain and in the Mediterranean region.

[Kachanov] In other words, Eduard Vasilyevich, Washington possesses powerful means of putting pressure on the Spanish Government. Could you perhaps dwell in more detail on what these means are?

[Kovalev] It needs to be noted here, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, that in the opinion of informed observers, alongside the so-called "Moroccan card," -- that is, the threat to Ceuta and Melilla, Spanish possessions on the African coast where the threat can become real only if the United States gives approval for action against Spain -- and the so-called Canaries card -- in the Canary Islands archipelago where it would not be difficult for the Americans to indulge in inciting separatists feeling since these already exists -- there is a much more important card, the economic and military one. In concrete terms, Washington is threatening to take the Socialist government by the throat when the time comes in the next 2 years for it to hold talks about rescheduling payment on the foreign debt. And this debt is owed chiefly to the United States. It is quite likely, it should be said, that in normal conditions the main aim of American policy in Spain will remain what is called strengthening the democratic system in the country. What is understood by this is the retention of the present capitalist system of public and social relations and the blocking of true social changes in Spain. So we see, comrades, that the position in Spain remains difficult and complicated. But Spain constantly recovers from history what has been its pride and tradition, that is, its national self-reliance. And one by one, dark pages left over from the fascist regime are struck from its history.

Greek-U.S. Views on U.S. Bases

[Kachanov] And, now Eduard Vasilyevich, let us talk a little about American military installations in Greece. Many of our listeners are interested in the progress of Greek-American talks on this problem. As is known, Papandreou's Socialist Government from the very beginning declared its intention of gradually eliminating the American military presence in its country. What can be said on this subject?

[Kovalev] According to press reports, the United States has no doubts that it will manage to hold on to the military bases leased to it by Greece, and that it will be able to force Greece to make concessions, by speculation about the size of American military aid which it has previously promised to increase. It needs to be said that Greece's position is not one of the easiest. The military-uniformed guests who have made themselves comfortable on Greek territory are not in any hurry to go home, even though the hosts are giving them stronger and stronger hints that they should. And they have been giving these hints for quite some time.

They are unwilling to thank their hosts for the long years of hospitality and to name a date for their departure. They insist quite categorically that the existence of the bases is supposedly to the advantage of both countries.

In reality, of course, this is far from true. Official representatives of Greece, among them the prime minister, have said repeatedly that the American bases are not beneficial for Greece and that their retention is not dictated even by the interests of the NATO alliance. Only one thing is beyond dispute: The retention of U.S. bases on Greek soil is to the advantage only of the United States. The Greek position on this question is clear. Papandreu has on several occasions, including at a recent rally in the city of Larisa on the anniversary of the peasant uprising in Thessalia, said that no self-respecting country and no self-respecting people can mortgage their own sovereign rights indefinitely. Unfortunately, the U.S. lethal bases, as they are often called in Greece, amount to just such an indefinite mortgage; and the demands from the Greek side for establishing a deadline for the existence of these bases and for drawing up a precise timetable for their removal from Greek soil, therefore, sound natural and logical. And Greece's demands that no actions should be committed from these base for the duration of their whole limited existence, which might undermine Greece's national security or pose a threat to the security of countries with which Greece has diplomatic and friendly relations, are understandable.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the attacks on the Papandreu government, both from Greek rightwingers and from NATO allies, and first and foremost among them the United States, cannot be interpreted otherwise than as blatant attempts to undermine the political stability of Greece, put it in a difficult economic position and force it to follow obediently in the wake of the present American Administration's aggressive policies. This is the real reason for the recent aggravation of the political situation in Greece and these are the ulterior motives for the actions by local Greek right-wing forces who would like to turn back the advance which Greece has begun to make along the road of democratic changes.

Political Situation in Thailand

Grigoriy Karpin from Sverdlovsk asks us to talk about the current political situation in Thailand. I think we shall be coming back to this subject in the coming weeks, since events are taking place in Thailand at present which may possibly be of great importance for the future of the country.

In general, the army has always played a significant, if not to say honorary, role in the history of Thailand. It also has experience in the violent seizure of power. Many probably recall the coups of 1976 and 1977, the repressions of progressively-minded circles and of students demanding democratic changes. The Thai Army has always been closely linked with the United States. And this, as you will understand, has given Washington the opportunity to have an active influence on Bangkok's foreign policy. One manifestation of this influence, it would appear, can be seen in the position taken by the Thai Government in relation to the People's Republic of Kampuchea. A direct analogy can be drawn here with Pakistan, for exactly as Pakistan is a bridgehead for the undeclared war against Afghanistan so Thailand is a base from which the Pol Pot supporters and other traitors of the Khmer people make their sorties. And, moreover, they do this under cover of Thai border guards and their artillery. It is undoubtedly premature as yet to suppose that the new government in Thailand to be formed after the elections will move away from this unpromising line and begin to make concrete efforts to restore good-neighborly relations with other countries in the region. All the same, one must hope for this.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD101405 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 10 Apr 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov, all-union radio foreign affairs commentator, Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the editorial board of NOVOYE VREMYA, and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international affairs observer of KOMMUNIST]

Warsaw Pact Ministers Meeting

[Text] [Andrianov] Among this week's international events a place of importance has been occupied by the latest meeting in Prague of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee. After all, this committee is one of the main bodies for coordinating the foreign policy actions of the members of the alliance. The results of its work in the Czechoslovak capital, which are set out in the communique on the meeting, show above all that the Warsaw Pact member-states are invariably acting in the spirit of the fraternal traditions that have arisen among socialist countries. They compare their views on international developments and jointly chart out the lines for the future. This is of very great importance, especially at the present time when there is a dangerous increase in international tension.

The participants in the meeting assembled in Prague 3 months after the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee had been held there. At that conference, as you will recall, a Political Declaration was adopted. That declaration contains a distinct and clear program for solving urgent international problems. In this connection the Warsaw Pact states not only reaffirmed their previous proposals, but also made a new important initiative by proposing a treaty with the NATO countries on the mutual nonuse of military force and the upholding of peaceful relations.

These proposals have been made even more topical by the development of events since the conference of the Political Consultative Committee. This was noted during the exchange of opinions by the Warsaw Pact foreign ministers, who stressed that the international situation remains complex and tense as a result of a further escalation of imperialist policy, above all by U.S. imperialism.

[Volskiy] Many questions were considered by the Foreign Ministers Committee, and there is no need to enumerate them. However, it is important to note that the approach to the questions was, as previously, dictated by the noble aims of averting nuclear war, continuing the process of detente, solving the problems of disarmament, strengthening security, and developing cooperation on the European Continent and throughout the whole world.

[Andrianov] Yes, the Prague meeting once again showed the sincere adherence of the socialist countries to the cause of peace and international cooperation. They are in favor of a dialogue with all those who are striving to strengthen peace and to preserve and deepen the relaxation of international tension. At the same time the committee meeting reaffirmed that the Warsaw Pact states are acting in a cohesive way and are full of profound mutual understanding. It is precisely this that ensures the durability and reliability of the international position of the socialist community. Our countries have sufficient good will and determination to proceed step-by-step toward a strengthening of European security and an improvement of the world political atmosphere.

At the same time our community has sufficient strength to withstand the military threat from imperialism. This thought was clearly stressed at the meetings this week during the official friendly visit to the GDR by Comrade Ustinov, the USSR defense minister.

The countries of our community are ready to respond to the designs of Western aggressive circles to press socialism by a further consolidation of their unity and their economic and defensive potential. The security of our countries and the fate of the whole world are connected with this.

Moscow Response to 'Interim Option'

[Nekrasov] In this connection, Boris Vasilyevich -- I mean in connection with the general analysis of the international situation -- I should like now to dwell in particular on relations between states with different social systems -- that is, on what is sometimes referred to as East-West relations. Precisely these issues have very ardently and very animatedly been discussed throughout the whole world. The reason for this is obvious. The Moscow press conference of Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko gave rise to a very broad wave of response throughout the entire world. There have been discussions on the subject of the Soviet Union's positions on the key issues of the day, which were contained in the interview and in particular in questions connected with the state of affairs in Europe.

In this connection I want to stress one thing immediately. As you will recall, Reagan made his statements about the so-called interim option on 30 March. The Soviet Union responded to them with the minimum delay on 2 April -- that is to say, without any procrastination. This timeliness and speed of reaction was noted throughout the whole world.

Over the past week, attention has been drawn in the West to the importance of the fact that Moscow needed little time to see the essential falsity of the Reagan proposal. The response to these proposals was clear, precise and immediate: They do not serve the interests of peace and they are aimed at deceiving the world public, which Washington is trying to divert from the main, fundamental thing -- its plans to continue the arms race.

[Nekrasov] This is very important, comrades. To judge by events, Washington planned to present the Reagan proposal about a new interim option just minutes, so to speak, before the start of the recess at the Geneva negotiations. One may suppose that in so doing, Washington obviously hoped that because of the recess, Moscow would reply to Reagan, if not on 17 May when the negotiations resume, then a little earlier. Meanwhile, world public would be aware of the matter only from Washington's point of view. The idea was clear: to get a monopoly for this point of view for a certain time and try to make use of it to raise a propaganda hullabaloo about U.S. peacefulness and Washington's alleged compliance and so forth. It was not successful; instead of being hypnotized by U.S. propaganda, the entire world has had the opportunity to contrast and compare Washington's approach -- which essentially contained nothing new in comparison with the notorious zero option -- with that of Moscow, which is imbued with a sincere aspiration to come to an agreement on the basis of the problems, proceeding from the principle of equality and equal security. Much is said in the world today not about Washington's peacefulness, as was hoped in the U.S. capital. But about Moscow's impressive calm and self-control in the face of the irresponsibility being shown by the ruling U.S. circles. Following Comrade Gromyko's statement, the assertions of some Western figures who argue that the more pressure exerted upon the Soviet Union, the greater the chances of an agreement, stand out equally clear. This agreement, of course is on the West's terms, or rather on U.S. terms. Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko made it quite clear that such assertions are wholly frivolous.

In the past, there also were people in the West wanting to profit from the peaceful policy of the Soviet state while pursuing their own mercenary aims. Vladimir Ilich Lenin had them in mind when he made it clear that they were cherishing vain illusions; Vladimir Ilich warned them when he said: We have repeatedly declared our aspiration for peace and our need of peace but we do not intend to let ourselves be stifled to death in the name of peace. The meaning of Lenin's statement is no less topical today.

This should be firmly borne in mind by certain present Western politicians, those who consider that peace on earth can be turned into some sort of coin of exchange, who wish to dictate their own conditions for maintaining peace, demanding one-sided advantages for themselves. One gets the impression that these politicians have a very original conception of the USSR's peace policy. To judge by events, such politicians see in this policy -- the readiness to struggle relentlessly and decisively in order to prevent a thermonuclear catastrophe and our aspiration to pursue unfailingly a peaceful foreign policy course -- some sort of condition that permit them to compel the Soviet Union to make concessions to the detriment of its security. Political wisdom is not, to put it mildly, conspicuous in these calculations.

Of course, the Soviet Union needs peace, peace is extremely necessary for all peoples on our planet because a war in our nuclear age would be a global catastrophe. All of mankind has an interest in preventing a thermonuclear tragedy. All sober-minded people understand this. It is appropriate to recall that just 5 months ago, at the November plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, it was emphasized that declarations in which normalization of relations is linked with the demand for the Soviet Union to pay for it by some sort of preliminary concessions in the most diverse spheres cannot be taken seriously. This was stated clearly and firmly. Therefore, there is no need for the West to burden itself with vain cares on this account.

All sorts of demagoguery were whipped up concerning the so-called interim option. Considerations about some sort of equality of rights, about some equal limits or other are involved here; however, the same old content lies behind these eloquent words. Well, we shall see. After all, Reagan has not presented his so-called interim option from any sense of well-being; as the saying goes: The situation was forced upon him. Morally and politically, Washington's position is now becoming feebler with every week that passes. Washington is finding itself increasingly isolated.

As for our country, a feature of international reactions to our position today is the emphasis on our flexibility and the desire to continue the dialogue. In London, THE OBSERVER writes that: The Soviet Union is leaving the door open for further talks. On the other side of the world, in Tokyo, MAINICHI uses almost the same words: The Soviet Union is showing a desire to continue talks. Similar comment and similar statements are being made in many capitals. Of course, talks of this nature can only be continued on an equal footing, as they say, on a basis of equality and on the principle of equal security. They must serve to strengthen peace, not to mask military preparations.

[Adrianov] Vadim Nikolayevich, you've dealt with some aspects of Comrade Gromyko's comments at his press conference. I should like, in turn, to touch on another question raised by the Soviet foreign minister. Washington's demand that our country also abolish its medium-range missiles in the Asian part of Soviet territory. The American Administration is trying to link this demand with the problem of reducing weapons of this type in Europe. But what grounds can there be for dragging Asia into this? That's the legitimate question asked by Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko. After all, the Washington Administration is aware of our country's position at the Geneva talks. If agreement were reached, the Soviet Union might withdraw some of its missiles from the European part of the USSR to the Asian part -- to an area from which they would not reach the territory of the countries of Western Europe and from where they would not pose a threat to those states. As to where to deploy those missiles in Asia -- that's the business of the Soviet Union and its sovereign right.

[Nekrasov] It is just that right that Washington is trying to assail -- in words, of course. This is being done with ill intent insofar as the U.S. Administration realizes that our country will categorically reject such a demand.

[Adrianov] By dragging the question of our missiles in Asia, "by the ears" as it were, into the problem of reducing weapons of this type in Europe, President Reagan is showing his unwillingness to achieve success at the Geneva talks. In short, it is one more example which vividly reveals the real motives of the transatlantic politicians who aver that they are hotly concerned about the security of the peoples of Europe. Concerning missiles in the Asian part of our country, the Soviet Union needs them to safeguard its own security, as Comrade Gromyko said. The Soviet foreign minister named specific regions which are crammed full of American medium-range nuclear weapons targeted on the territory of our country. And we have the right, for purposes of defense, to possess something with which to counter those weapons. It is widely known that the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries of socialism tirelessly emphasize the need to seek, by political means, a solution to the problems existing in various parts of the world and the need for efforts to promote the strengthening of peace in Asia and the Pacific. This, by the way, is noted in the documents of the Prague conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the member-states of the Warsaw Pact. The relevance of these conclusions is obvious. However, it becomes clearer still if, for example we take an objective look at the situation in eastern Asia -- if we appraise objectively the situation that is developing there as a result of the further strengthening of the American-Japanese military alliance and of the noticeable increase in the activity of militarist circles in Japan itself.

U.S.-Japanese 'Alliance'

[Volskiy] Indeed, this alliance -- the Washington-Tokyo alliance -- was most eloquently characterized in the report which was presented not so long ago to the U.S. Congress by Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense. He referred outrightly to Japan as a forward frontier in the global strategy of the United States. Well, one could not put this more accurately than the chief of the Pentagon did himself.

[Adrianov] Yes, this was stated very frankly, and this frankness evoked serious alarm among the Japanese public. This alarm was reflected in statements in the press which observed that Japan had been included in the global strategy of the United States within the framework of their security treaty had been put on the same footing as Washington's relations with the NATO countries. In this respect the newspaper noted that the Pentagon's assessment of the role of Japan and South Korea as the forward line in America's strategy of confrontation with the Soviet Union is extremely dangerous.

[Volskiy] Indeed, Tokyo's official spokesmen have been attempting to placate the Japanese public with assurances that the military alliance with the United States allegedly serves only the interests of the defense of the Japanese archipelago.

[Adrianov] Tokyo indeed does not tire of giving the assurance that it is allegedly only concerned with the defense of Japan and that it is alleged only for the sake of that goal that almost 120 Pentagon military bases and installations are located in Japanese territory, bases where almost 50,000 American servicemen are stationed. But why in that case, is the military equipment which the United States provides for its Armed Forces in Japan far from being defensive in character? After all, it is quite obvious that by strengthening its military cooperation with Washington, Tokyo is providing the Pentagon with Japanese territory for the deployment of offensive means for waging war.

It is sufficient to recall only the fact that the Japanese authorities have agreed to the stationing at the Misawa Air Base of two squadrons of American F-16 combat aircraft, that is to say, 48 fighter-bombers that are able to carry nuclear weapons. This is a serious strike force. And Misawa itself is situated in the north of Honshu Island. One only has to look at a map and assess the location of this base where these American nuclear-capable aircraft have found a haven to realize that the essence of this undertaking is deliberately anti-Soviet in its orientation and has not the slightest relationship to Japan's defense. Moreover, the Pentagon does not conceal its schemes. Its people smugly hold forth about the range of the F-16 aircraft, estimating what points in Soviet territory the aircraft are capable of reaching with their nuclear weapons.

Speaking at his press conference, Comrade Gromyko noted that Japan and the waters surrounding that country are full of nuclear weapons and their corresponding launchers.

[Volskiy] Nevertheless the Tokyo authorities state that Japan intends to continue adhering to the three so-called non-nuclear principles -- not to produce nuclear weapons, not to possess such weapons and not to import them.

[Andrianov] Such statements are indeed being made, but something else is well-known. The Tokyo authorities have officially agreed to the entry into Japanese ports of American nuclear aircraft carriers and other U.S. warships sailing in the Pacific Ocean. These ships -- and it is no secret -- are capable of carrying and do carry nuclear weapons, particularly cruise missiles. Incidentally, American submarines that carry nuclear weapons have long since received the secret go-ahead from Tokyo to call at Japanese ports. This has repeatedly caused an acute situation in the Japanese parliament and stormy demonstrations of protest by the Japanese public. However, despite this, Tokyo has agreed to extend the list of American warships which are allowed to drop anchor off the shores of Japan.

The noteworthy thing is that the Japanese Government does not intend to take an interest in whether there are or are not nuclear weapons aboard the American ships which call at Japanese ports. This was stated by a spokesman for Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. But in that case, how will observance of one of the three non-nuclear principles weapons on to Japanese territory -- look? No, one may speak here not of observing but of violating this principle, violating it silently but quite consciously. Of course, it is not fortuitous that objective international observers consider that Japan is more and more openly acting the role of nuclear armor-bearer for the United States. Considering this circumstance as well as the fact that the Pentagon has at its disposal a whole complex of nuclear weapons bases in other areas surrounding the Soviet Union, the complete inappropriateness of Washington's demand that missiles be eliminated in the Asian part of our country becomes clear.

[Volskiy] What you were saying about Japan, Boris Vasilyevich, seems to underline a general pattern: alongside the vertical whipping up of the arms race -- to put it like that -- tension is being raised laterally so to speak, in terms of geography. And this is no less dangerous.

U.S., Israeli Interventionists' Actions

[Andrianov] Dmitriy Antonovich, here is an example of that very thing: the events in Nicaragua.

American propaganda is trying to portray the matter thus: that a civil war of an internal nature is going on there. The facts, however, prove that what is involved is intervention from outside organized by the Pentagon and the CIA.

[Volskiy] Of course. The revolutionary Sandinista regime is not to the liking of the fugitive Samozists - or Samozites, as they are called. These are people dissatisfied with this regime within the country, too, as is inevitable following such an abrupt sociopolitical revolution as took place -- and is still taking place, for it is still far from complete -- in Nicaragua. On the historical level, however, the internal conflict has been resolved there, for the overwhelming majority of the people supports the Sandinistas, otherwise they could not even start building a new society in the most difficult conditions of virtual American blockade and sabotage. Now, as we see, this sabotage has developed into the organization of direct invasions, and from various directions, at that. The Nicaraguans describe this as gradual intervention. The aims of such tactics are obvious: to provoke antigovernment protests if not in one area, then in another; and second to dissipate the Sandinista forces and disorient the national army command.

There is a broader political goal here, too, however, that of expanding the hotbed of tension in Central America.

[Andrianov] Dmitriy Antonovich, is it not strange, however, from the viewpoint of normal political logic, that the Washington administration should with its own hands inflame yet another military hotbed in direct proximity to the United States? Is El Salvador not enough?

[Volskiy] You mentioned El Salvador, Boris Vasilyevich; I believe there is indeed a mutual link here, but not at all the same link as the Washington propagandists try to show when they allege that the Nicaraguan leaders are virtually directing the hands of the rebels in El Salvador belonging to the Farabundo Marti Front.

No, the essence of the matter lies elsewhere; that is, the American henchmen in El Salvador are incapable of coping with the popular uprising. And in addition, they are fatally at loggerheads among themselves. And so the American Administration thinks it can find a way out of the impasse by inflaming military actions in neighbouring Nicaragua.

The Americans' actions in Central America are often compared with their intervention in Indochina in the 1960s and 1970s. And it is indeed right to do so, for let us recall that there too the same vicious strategy was adopted. The Americans spread the war in Vietnam to the present Kampuchea -- Cambodia as it was called then -- and into Laos, and it is well known how all this finished for Washington.

[Nekrasov] This, Dmitriy Antonovich, is borne out too by the actions of the Israeli military in the Middle East, which is trying to imitate its elder partner. Does not the present shelling by Israeli interventionists of the positions of the Syrian troops from the inter-Arab forces deployed in the Lebanese Al-Biq'a Valley bear witness to the use of the same means?

[Volskiy] In addition, all this is accompanied by threats against Syria and, it should be said, confirms the latest development of events, confirms the timely nature of the warnings to the aggressor which were contained in the recent statement on the Near East issue issued by the Soviet Government.

A double danger may be seen in Israel's anti-Syrian provocations. On the one hand, Tel Aviv counts on thereby creating a situation such that the Israeli occupation of Lebanon itself, and also of the Golan Heights, Gaza and the West Bank, somehow fades into the background in the public eye and is almost forgotten, so that the occupiers will have the opportunity of doing virtually all they want to there even as far as direct genocide. As the fresh facts about poisonings on the West Bank prove.

There is another side to the matter, too. The present military provocations against Syria and the propaganda attacks against it are very reminiscent of what happened not long before Israel's invasion of Lebanon. Then, too, the defensive measures of the Palestinians and of the inter-Arab force stationed in Lebanon and also -- as now -- the defensive measures of Syria -- just as is happening now -- were then represented as almost a threat to the existence of Israel. This propaganda hysteria over the defensive measures in Syria is all the time being artificially whipped up, just as it was whipped up in relation to the Palestinians and Lebanon before the invasion of Lebanon, for which Washington ultimately gave the go-ahead.

[Adrianov] But Syria, Dmitriy Antonovich, figuratively speaking, is a tough nut. It has powerful defenses and reliable friends too. And you remember the staunch and heroic resistance that the Israeli aggressors met with last summer even from the poorly armed, partisan Palestinian formations.

[Volskiy] That heroic resistance, Boris Vasilyevich, which continues in other forms, continues to this day, is something they would do well to remember not only in Tel Aviv but also in Washington, because it was not only in words that the Americans gave the go-ahead at that time to the Begin government. They underwrote the aggressor by stationing their troops under the flag of the multinational force of the NATO countries in the Egyptian Sinai Peninsula. They underwrote them from the Egyptian side. Now, this preliminary insurance has been intensified; the Americans as members of that same NATO multinational force, are already also stationed, as you know, in Lebanon; and there are persistent reports that their numerical strength there is about to be tripled almost -- doubled, anyway -- and very soon. It is clear, in this situation, how important it is for the Arab peoples to intensify their vigilance to strive for unity and to interact with their friends.

Support for 'Peace' Movement

[Nekrasov] Comrades, I should like to say something about a series of events that have been a feature of the past week. I refer to the massive antiwar demonstrations in the West, in many countries. These were militant demonstrations. I must say in general that the intensity of the public struggle for peace is increasing steadily from month to month. We have seen clashes with the police in which tear gas and batons were used and people arrested. All that has been happening. On the other hand, I would like to remark on what you might call the more deliberate nature of the demonstrations. This is not a spontaneous protest against the policy of an insane arms race, as has been the case previously; it is not a manifestation of fear of nuclear war. It is the conscious action of hundreds of thousands of people, behind whom stand millions upon millions.

[Andrianov] To conclude our roundtable meeting, I would like to quote an excerpt from the CPSU Central Committee resolution, published this week on the 80th anniversary of the second Russian Socialist Democratic Workers' Party Congress.

III. 11 Apr 83

CC 13

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

This important party document says, in part, that the peace program for the 80's adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress indicates a real and practical path toward delivering mankind from the threat of a thermonuclear war and freeing it from the burden of the arms race. As the events of the week just ending confirm, it is that path that is being ever more resolutely chosen by all people in the world who cherish peace and the security of the human race.

There we end our broadcast. Thank you for your attention, esteemed listeners. Goodbye, and best wishes.

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL CONCLUDES CONGRESS

Brandt Re-elected Chairman

LD101637 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Text] Montechoro (Portugal) April 10 TASS -- Socialist International closed its 16th congress here today. Delegates from 75 socialist and social-democratic parties, representing 20 million party members, discussed the main questions of our time, paying special attention to problems of peace and disarmament and analysis of the economic crisis in the West. Socialist International's new leadership was elected. Willy Brandt was re-elected its chairman.

The forum's participants, coming out in favour of curbing the arms race, emphasised that it is impossible to ensure international security by permanently increasing arsenals and perfecting weapons. General and complete disarmament, says a document approved at the congress, can be achieved only through resolute and persistent actions of the entire world community.

Stressing the need to restore in Europe the spirit of detente, the delegates favoured the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones, specifically in northern Europe, in the Balkans and in parts of the Pacific Ocean.

CPSU Central Committee Message

PM110929 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 83 First Edition p 1

["Text" of undated CPSU message: "To the 16th Socialist International Congress"]

[Text] Moscow, April 8 -- To the 16th Congress of the Socialist International

Esteemed delegates,

Your congress is taking place at an extremely important moment of history. As is known, the congress will discuss questions of international security, peace and disarmament. The situation in this field gives rise to serious alarm. It is this that prompts the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to address the following message to you.

Every responsible politician cannot but realize that the time reserve remaining for solving problems of disarmament and security is limited and is decreasing all the time. In conditions of the rapid perfection of military technology the arms race threatens to come out from under control.

Meantime calls are being heard again and again for intensifying preparations for nuclear war, for creating conditions for "victory" in such a war, and the "right" of the first nuclear strike is being championed.

These theses contradict the conscience of mankind and are incompatible with all norms of morals accepted in civilized society. Urgent, immediate measures are needed to stop mankind's slide toward nuclear catastrophe. No task can be more important now.

Our viewpoint is known: We are convinced that there exists a real possibility of preventing a further worsening of the situation, of reversing the present dangerous development. The concrete initiatives and proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are subordinated to this aim.

You certainly know that in January of this year a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty countries adopted in Prague a Political Declaration which sets out a peaceful alternative to the arms race and growing confrontation. The Soviet Union has unilaterally assumed the obligation not to be the first to resort to the use of nuclear arms and calls on other nuclear powers to follow suit. Jointly with other countries of the Warsaw Treaty the USSR offers the member-states of the North Atlantic alliance the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and on the maintenance of relations of peace.

We are prepared at any moment to agree on a mutual basis on the freezing of the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States. We stand for a quick and resultful conclusion of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear arms in Europe and the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. We stand for the speediest reaching of agreement on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests so that new variants and types of these weapons could no longer be created. We come out for the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons.

Recently the socialist countries submitted new, simple and clear proposals at the talks in Vienna on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. The Soviet Union, the countries of the Warsaw Treaty are prepared to study any other constructive proposals directed at solving the key problems of international life in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security. Of key importance now is the question of how to avoid a new round of the nuclear missile arms race in Europe. The deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe would create a most serious danger first of all for the European peoples, would lead to a still greater, drastic worsening of the international situation and a new spiral of the nuclear arms race.

A new war, this time a nuclear one, could be launched from the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany contrary to the will of the overwhelming majority of its population and even without the knowledge of its authorities.

The situation at the talks in Geneva cannot but give rise to concern which, as we know, is shared also by many parties of the Socialist International. There are possibilities for finding a solution, but what is absent is the other side's sincere striving for a just accord. The so called "interim option" set forth now by President Reagan, is directed at deluding the public, at deflating the new wave of the mass anti-missile movement that is now rising, at showing before the NATO allies the mythical "flexibility" of the United States at the talks and at levelling charges of "intransigence" against the Soviet Union which cannot accept and never will accept proposals violating the military strategic parity and the principle of equal security, is absolutely clear that the aim of the "interim option" is to start at all cost the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe under the pretext that after that things supposedly will become simpler.

III. 11 Apr 83

CC 15

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

But those who want to use the talks to secure military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union are making a dangerous miscalculation. This was stated very definitely by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yu.V. Andropov in his answers to the questions by a PRAVDA correspondent. They contain a fundamentally important presentation of our positions on pressing questions of disarmament and our evaluation of the foreign policy course of the American Administration that is dangerous to the destiny of universal peace. It is utterly clear that this course is directed not only against the Soviet Union and socialist countries in general but also against the interests of all peoples, of the whole of mankind.

We would also like to draw the attention of the congress to the proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries directed at solving by political means the existing and preventing new military conflicts in Asia, first of all in the Near and Middle East, in Africa and Central America. There can be no two views that a political settlement in these vast and important areas of the world would be an important contribution to the strengthening of universal peace.

In recent years representatives of the CPSU have repeatedly discussed with the leadership of many socialist and social democratic parties topical questions of averting nuclear war and ending the arms race. Our party maintains contacts with the consultative council of the Socialist International on disarmament and views them as fruitful. We also cooperate with other international bodies in the search for ways leading to the preservation and strengthening of peace. These are good examples of cooperation of parties and organizations professing different ideologies, convictions and views, but realizing their responsibility for the destiny of their peoples and the whole of mankind.

Esteemed delegates of the congress,

On behalf of the 18 million members of the CPSU, on behalf of the entire Soviet people we call on socialists and social democrats, on the workers, democratic movement associated with them, to increase their contribution to the cause of saving mankind from nuclear catastrophe, to raise the activity of the popular masses and their organizations in the struggle for peace and detente, to increase the practical effectiveness of their actions on concrete questions of international security and ending the arms race.

We express hope that the decisions of the congress will be up to the challenge of the moment and facilitate peaceful and mutually useful cooperation and especially understanding in Europe and in the whole world that is so needed now by all the peoples. We wish your congress success.

[Signed] Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

GROMYKO ARTICLE NOTES U.S. BUSINESS 'EXPLOITATION'

LD081915 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS -- Having identified the domestic and foreign policy objectives of the United States with big business interests, the Reagan administration has lifted all restrictions on the expansion of U.S. private businesses in the developing countries, Andrey Gromyko writes in the April issue of the journal MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA. He stresses in an article entitled "Basic Characteristic of the Export of U.S. Capital in the Present Conditions" that "in the idea of the Washington strategists, the emergent countries should become the target of even harsher exploitation and oppression."

American capital is invested on a particularly vast scale in the countries and territories of Latin America and the Caribbean, such as Brazil, Mexico, Panama, Argentina and Venezuela. In 1981 they accounted for roughly 70 percent of the sum total of U.S. direct capital investments in the developing world.

The 1970s saw the growth of U.S. direct investment in Asia, first and foremost in Southeast Asia. (The share of Asia in 1981 was 23.2 per cent of the U.S. total direct investment in the developing world.) American businessmen are attracted to that area by a favourable investment climate, rich mineral reserves and cheap manpower.

The machinery used by the American companies to reap profit from operations with Mideastern oil was dramatically revamped during the 1970s. The first half of the 1970s, Andrey Gromyko stresses, should be viewed as a landmark at which, on the one hand, the growth of U.S. direct investment in the Near and Middle East had peaked out (roughly three billion dollars in 1974) and, on the other, the size of U.S. companies' investments began to shrink dramatically because of the nationalisation of the property of foreign oil companies. However, the diminishing role of companies as direct investors in oil production did not at all mean any substantial reduction in the scope of U.S. operations in the oil industries of the developing countries.

As before, huge profits are carried out of the developing countries. Between 1966 and 1981 those countries accounted for one-third to more than one-half of all the profits on direct investments that were sent back to the United States. U.S. direct investments in those countries yield [words indistinct] corporations about one-half of all the repatriated profits. This example, Andrey Gromyko notes, graphically illustrates the U.S. special stake in ensuring its "vital interests" in the developing countries and puts into sharp focus the role of U.S. imperialism as the chief financial exploiter of the developing countries.

Practical calculations expose the falsity of the claims of the present-day U.S. Administration that American private investments facilitate "the outflow of resources" from the United States to the developing countries, Andrey Gromyko notes.

III. 11 Apr 83

U S S R I N T E R N A T I O N A L A F F A I R S
C H I N A

B 1

USSR BORDER TRADE ACCORD WITH PRC REPORTED

OW111101 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1000 GMT
11 Apr 83

[Text] A protocol on border trade between the Far East Region of the Soviet Union and Heilongjiang Province of China was signed in Harbin on 10 April. The two countries will continue to develop trade cooperation and business exchanges between them in accordance with the protocol.

PRC COACH INTERVIEWED IN BEIJING ON TOURNAMENTS

OW091443 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1230 GMT 7 Apr 83

[Text] In an interview with a TASS reporter in Beijing, Ma Shi, coach of the Chinese gymnastic team which took part in the international tournaments in Moscow and Riga, pointed out that he was very satisfied with the tournaments in which the Chinese athletes participated and won first places. The Chinese coach stressed that the participants' activities in the tournaments were widely covered by the Soviet press.

While in Moscow, the Soviet capital, the Chinese team visited scenic spots of historic interest, the Lenin Mausoleum, the national economic exhibition and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. Leaders of the Chinese gymnastic team also held a forum at the Soviet Sports Commission to discuss mass sports in the Soviet Union.

DEFENSE MINISTER USTINOV CONCLUDES VISIT TO GDR

7 Apr Activities

PM081410 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Apr 83 Second Edition

[TASS report: "On Fraternal GDR Soil"]

[Text] Berlin, 7 Apr -- The Soviet military delegation on an official friendly visit to the GDR has visited the F. Engels Military Academy of the GDR National People's Army in Dresden and familiarized itself with the training process. The members of the delegation talked with the academy's specialists, academic staff and students. The Soviet military delegation then visited the Dresden art gallery.

In the afternoon the Soviet military delegation was received by E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council. A friendly conversation took place.

In a festive atmosphere, E. Honecker presented Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and other members of the Soviet military delegation with GDR orders. D.F. Ustinov was awarded the Order of Karl Marx.

Addressing the recipients of the awards, E. Honecker noted the USSR Defense Ministry's great services in the sphere of strengthening the fraternal relations between the GDR and the USSR and the fraternity of class and arms between the two countries' armed forces.

He went on: The elimination of imperialism's military superiority as a result of the USSR's tremendous efforts and the establishment of approximate strategic military balance between the Soviet Union and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO are an invaluable feat in the name of peace.

The longest period of peace in Europe in our century so far would have inconceivable without this historic gain. This approximate strategic military parity has been and remains a reliable guarantee of peace. We agree entirely and completely with Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and our comrade and friend, who stated recently that everything will be done to preserve this parity.

Socialism's military might is a threat to no one and is not a means of blackmail. Instead it serves the interests of the defense of our peoples' revolutionary gains and the legitimate interests of their security. It demands peace when faced by a grave international situation where the adventurists among imperialism's forces are harboring irresponsible and insane plans of achieving victory in a world nuclear conflict.

It is truly very fortunate for mankind that it has in the Soviet Union a mighty bulwark of peace and that peace is no longer defenseless in the face of the imperialist instigators of war. Firmly bolstered forever by the fraternal union with the USSR and the other socialist countries, the GDR will continue to make its contribution to the cause of the reliable defense of socialism and peace.

The indestructible combat collaboration between the SED and the CPSU and the friendship between our states and peoples guarantee our further successful progress.

On his own behalf and on behalf of the award recipients, D.F. Ustinov sincerely thanked the SED Central Committee and the GDR Government for the high award.

Members of the Politburo and secretaries of the SED Central Committee were present at the award presentation.

On the same day D.F. Ustinov gave a reception at the USSR Embassy which was attended by E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council; W. Stoph, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and chairman of GDR Council of Ministers; Army General H. Hoffmann, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR national defense minister; and other party and state figures for the GDR side; and members of the military delegation as well as P.A. Abrasimov, USSR ambassador to the GDR; Army General M.M. Zaytsev, commander in chief of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany; and Col Gen A.D. Lizichev, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany, for the Soviet side.

Addressing those present, D.F. Ustinov said: We sincerely and cordially welcome you to the USSR Embassy. The Soviet military delegation's visit to the GDR has come to an end. During our stay in your country we have had meetings and talks with many GDR party and state figures.

We received great satisfaction from the warm meeting and friendly talk with Comrade Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, chairman of the GDR State Council and chairman of the GDR National Defense Council.

During the meetings and conversation a useful exchange of opinions took place on a number of questions of military cooperation between our countries. We hope that the decisions we have made and the agreements reached will help further strengthen the defense capability of the USSR and the GDR and the entire socialist community.

During the visit we went to a number of labor collectives, visited military units and saw much of interest in our German friends' country. We were given a warm, fraternal reception wherever we went.

Allow me to express heartfelt gratitude to the SED Central Committee, to you, Comrade E. Honecker, to the GDR Government, the National Defense Ministry, servicemen of the National People's Army and all GDR working people for their cordiality, hospitality and good and sincere feelings toward the CPSU, the Soviet people and their Armed Forces.

During the visit to the GDR, we have had an opportunity to see for ourselves again how purposefully and professionally your country's people are working to fulfill the 10th SED Congress decisions. The creative and enterprising mass movement of GDR working people, as E. Honecker has noted, has acquired unprecedented scale and is geared toward the successful implementation of the current 5-year plan targets in all spheres.

We Soviet people are sincerely glad at the achievements of your republic's working people in building a developed socialist society and increasing your country's economic and defense might and wish them further successes in this.

The meetings on the fraternal GDR's soil have been for us further vivid evidence of the indestructibility of the friendship and close cooperation between our countries' peoples and armies.

We note with satisfaction that the friendly ties between the servicemen of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany and personnel of the GDR National People's Army are strengthening. That is shown both in joint exercises and the exchanging of experience of combat and political training and in internationalist and patriotic education and the holding of a number of other functions.

We offer sincere gratitude to the SED Central Committee, to you personally, Comrade E. Honecker, and to the GDR Government and National Defense Ministry for the constant attention to the servicemen of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany. In turn, we will do everything necessary to develop and strengthen the friendship between the Soviet servicemen and servicemen of the National People's Army and its good traditions.

This friendship shows our parties' best traditions gained in the joint struggle against fascism and for the triumph of proletarian, socialist internationalism.

Friendship and close cooperation help our countries to successfully resolve the tasks of economic development and of strengthening defense capability. These questions, as comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has stressed, have always occupied and will continue to occupy a special, priority place in the USSR's international policy. A firm socialist community is also a decisive factor in the struggle to avert another world war.

We hope that the Soviet military delegation's visit to the GDR and the meetings and conversations with our German friends will serve this important and noble cause.

We are sincerely grateful to Comrade Heinz Hoffmann, GDR national defense minister, for the good and efficient organization of the visit, the constant attention paid to our delegation and our thorough familiarization with the combat training, lives and daily routine of GDR National People's Army servicemen.

On behalf of the Soviet military delegation and all USSR Armed Forces personnel, D.F. Ustinov wished the fraternal German people and the National People's Army servicemen successful building of developed socialism and its reliable defense.

He proposed a toast to the SED Central Committee headed by Comrade E. Honecker, to the CPSU Central Committee headed by Comrade YuV. Andropov, to the indestructible friendship between the fraternal socialist countries' peoples, to the close combat collaboration between their armies, and to the health of Army General H. Hoffmann, GDR National Defense minister.

H. Hoffmann then delivered a speech. He said that the Soviet military delegation's visit had developed into a new and convincing manifestation of the fraternal alliance between the two states' peoples and armies.

Given the more acute attacks by the enemies of peace and socialism, H. Hoffmann noted, the visit has shown once more that the socialist community is capable of fittingly rebuffing any imperialist adventure.

Your visit has strengthened the confidence of our people and their Army that the Soviet Union and its armed forces and the defensive community of the socialist states of the Warsaw Pact are an insuperable shield for peace.

We will do our utmost to ensure the high political and military vigilance, high defense readiness and efficient collaboration of our states and armies here in the heart of Europe. For us, the attitude to the Soviet Union was and remains the touchstone of internationalist policy, the minister stated.

The peoples of Europe could not have lived in peace for 38 years now without the Soviet Union and its political, moral and military-economic might.

Our community and the fraternal alliance of Warsaw Pact states closely united around the Soviet Union are the most important guarantee that the struggle for peace will also be waged successfully in years to come. The socialist GDR has always sided with the Soviet Union. And no one will ever change that.

In conclusion, H. Hoffmann proposed a toast to the eternal friendship between the great Soviet people and the GDR people, to the combat collaboration between the Marxist-Leninist parties, to the brotherhood in class and arms between the valiant Soviet Army and the National People's Army, to the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, its general secretary, to the SED Central Committee and Comrade E. Honecker, its general secretary, to Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, USSR defense minister, and to the comrades accompanying him.

Comments on Military Potential

PM091925 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Apr 83 First Edition pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report: "A New and Higher Level for Combat Readiness"]

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, who has been in the GDR on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the SED Central Committee and the GDR State Council, visited the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany [GSFG].

The USSR defense minister toured training center facilities and attended field exercises involving subunits and a regimental training exercise involving combat firing by the "N" Guards Motorized Infantry Regiment reinforced with subunits from other categories of troops. Combat aircraft and helicopters were also used during the exercise.

After the exercise a meeting took place. Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov addressed the participants in the exercise. He conveyed combat greetings and best wishes to the men of the Guards Motorized Infantry Regiment and all GSFG servicemen from Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and described the work being done by the CPSU and the Soviet people to fulfill the 25th CPSU Congress decisions.

In his speech the USSR defense minister pointed up the need to really learn military affairs as the great Lenin taught and urged constant progress in combat training, avoidance of complacency, speedy mastery of assigned equipment and weapons and learning of the ability to skillfully utilize them in various kinds of combat operation.

Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov stressed that military skill, tactical competence and boldness and the ability to hit the enemy with your first shot or first missile launch constitute the guarantee of victory in combat.

Addressing the servicemen -- motorized infantrymen, tankmen, artillerymen and airmen -- Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov noted that they had displayed great skill during the exercise. The task is to develop creativity and initiative more boldly, consolidate and augment positive achievements and persistently eliminate shortcomings. Socialist competition is an important lever in improving the quality of combat and political training. It is a matter of honor for servicemen, subunits and units to completely fulfill their adopted pledges.

The USSR defense minister pointed to the importance of maintaining firm troop discipline, order and organization in all things. He stressed the importance of improving the effectiveness of party political work, educating servicemen in a spirit of friendship and combat cohesion, rallying troop collectives and on this basis achieving good results in resolving all troop training tasks.

We have created all the necessary conditions for successful combat training, Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov noted. And these conditions must be rationally utilized in the interests of improving combat readiness.

This is particularly important for GSFG servicemen who, with GDR National People's Army servicemen, are in the front line of the defense of the socialist community countries.

Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov stressed that the military-political situation in the world is complex and that the imperialists, primarily the United States, are striving to achieve military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries. Recently the U.S. President again attempted to justify what is essentially a new stage in the buildup of U.S. military preparations. Here the leaders of the U.S. Administration are distorting the facts in alleging that the United States has fallen behind the USSR in arms and are again talking about the so-called "Soviet military threat." However, these allegations are a deliberate lie. They are designed to intimidate the peoples.

Behind a screen of distorted facts the U.S. Administration is deploying more and more new arms, particularly nuclear arms, in an attempt to secure one-sided advantages for itself. But as Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed in his replies to a PRAVDA correspondent's questions, all attempts to achieve military superiority over the USSR are futile.

The Soviet Union is in a position to create any weapon that the enemy might possess.

In order to end the arms race and prevent a nuclear war our party is waging a persistent and consistent struggle to strengthen peace. It is doing everything to secure a calm and peaceful future for present and future generations. This is the objective of the party's policy and it will never deviate from it.

The Armed Forces are the reliable guard of our people's socialist gains. The Communist Party and the Soviet people are doing everything to ensure that our Army and Navy need for nothing in terms of modern equipment and weapons and material resources. Our servicemen have everything necessary for a full life and combat training. And they are grateful to the party and the Soviet people for their tireless concern.

The USSR defense minister stressed the importance of further strengthening combat cooperation with GDR National People's Army servicemen in successfully resolving tasks relating to the defense of the peaceful labor of the fraternal socialist countries' peoples. He expressed confidence that the personnel of the subunits that participated in the exercise and all GSFG servicemen will continue to tirelessly raise combat readiness and improve their combat skill.

The meeting was addressed by Guards Lt Col V. Dyukov and Guards Sgt Yu. Sukolov. They thanked the Communist Party for its tireless concern for the Armed Forces and assured the CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade Yu. Andropov that they will continue to worthily fulfill their patriotic and international duty.

The USSR defense minister had a talk with GSFG leading personnel.

With Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense in the GSFG, were USSR Deputy Ministers Marshal of the Soviet Union V.I. Petrov, Chief Marshal of Aviation P.S. Kutakhov and Army General V.M. Shabanov and Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

The USSR defense minister was accompanied by Army General M.M. Zaytsev, commander in chief, and Col Gen A.D. Lizichev, member of the Military Council and chief of the GSFG Political Directorate.

Report on Berlin Departure

PM111208 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Apr 83 Second Edition p 1

[TASS dispatch: "Departure From Berlin"]

[Text] Berlin, 8 Apr -- The Soviet military delegation led by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, has left Berlin. It was in the GDR on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the SED Central Committee and the GDR State Council.

The delegation was seen off at the airport by Army General H. Hoffmann, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR minister of national defense, other officials and also USSR Ambassador to the GDR P.A. Abrasimov.

Returns to Moscow 9 Apr

LD091346 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Text] The Soviet military delegation headed by Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of defense and marshal of the Soviet Union, returned to Moscow today.

III. 11 Apr 83

F 7

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
EASTERN EUROPE

The delegation was in the GDR on an official, friendly visit at the invitation of the SED Central Committee and the GDR State Council. The delegation was met at the airport by Comrade Aliyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials,

ROMANOV ATTENDS KARL MARX CONFERENCE IN GDR

Departs Moscow 10 Apr

LD101154 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Text] A CPSU delegation led by Comrade Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, today left Moscow for Berlin to take part in an international scientific conference on Karl Marx and the Contemporary World -- The Struggle For Peace and Social Progress at the invitation of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee.

The delegation includes Comrades Zimyanin and Rusakov, secretaries of the party Central Committee; and Comrades Yegorov and Zagladin, members of the CPSU Central Committee. At the airport the delegation was seen off by Comrade Gorbachev, member of Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Ryzhkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and other comrades.

Report on Arrival

LD102136 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Text] A CPSU delegation led by Comrade Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, arrived in Berlin today at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany for the international scientific conference entitled Karl Marx and Our Time -- The Struggle for Peace and Social Progress.

The delegation was met at the airport by Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council; by members of the Politburo and secretaries of the SED Central Committee; and other officials.

Conference Opens 11 Apr

LD111004 Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 11 Apr 83

[Text] Berlin April 11 TASS -- An international scientific conference opened here today. It is being held by the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SUPG] and its theme is "Karl Marx and Our Time -- The Struggle for Peace and Social Progress".

The six-day conference is one of the main events held on the occasion of the 165th anniversary of the birth and centenary of the death of the founder of scientific communism, the great teacher and leader of the international proletariat Karl Marx.

Attending it are delegations of communist and workers parties, revolutionary-democratic parties, national-liberation movements, socialist and social-democratic parties from all continents.

III. 11 Apr 83

F 8

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
EASTERN EUROPE

Opening the conference, the general secretary of the SUPG Central Committee, Chairman of the State Council of the GDR Erich Honecker warmly greeted its participants. He made a speech in which he stressed the unfading importance of Marxism.

ROMANOV RECEIVES POLISH AMBASSADOR IN LENINGRAD

LD070950 Leningrad Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 24 Mar 83

[Excerpts] Yesterday, Grigoriy Vasilyevich Romanov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Leningrad Obkom, received Stanislaw Kociolek, the extraordinary and plenipotentiary ambassador of the Polish People's Republic in the Soviet Union, who is on an official visit to Leningrad. Also participating in the talks were Comrade Zakharov, secretary of Leningrad Obkom and Comrade Zubarev, assistant to the member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Leningrad Obkom; and Comrade (Birekewicz), consul general of the Polish People's Republic in Leningrad.

WOZNIAK, WARSAW PZPR DELEGATION VISIT MOSCOW

LD091223 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Text] A meeting took place on 8 April between the Moscow Party aktiv and a delegation of the Warsaw PZPR Committee headed by Comrade Wozniak, member of the Party Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Warsaw PZPR Committee. Welcoming the guests, Comrade Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Obkom, said that the fraternal friendship between the Soviet and Polish peoples, at the source of which stands Vladimir Illich Lenin, fully corresponds to the fundamental interests of our countries and the entire socialist community and is an important factor of peace and stability in Europe. This friendship, founded upon the principles of Marxism-Leninism, socialist internationalism, equality, mutual respect, and noninterference in each other's affairs, was strengthened during the joint struggle against fascism and for the elimination of the grievous consequences of the war and was further developed during the years of socialist construction.

USSR EMBASSY PROTESTS FLAG MISUSE IN WEST BERLIN

LD071926 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 7 Apr 83

[Text] Berlin April 7 TASS -- The Soviet Embassy in the GDR lodged a protest with the authorities of the three powers in West Berlin: the United States, Britain and France.

At present, the document says, a congress of the German Society of Surgeons of the Federal Republic of Germany is in progress in West Berlin. The congress has been convened in that city contrary to the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, stipulating that West Berlin does not belong to West Germany. Trying to create the impression that the Soviet Union has something to do with or even is involved in this illegal undertaking, its organisers have hoisted the Soviet flag without the consent of the Soviet side in front of the building which the congress is holding its meetings.

In this connection, the document points out, the Embassy of the USSR in the GDR has lodged a protest with the authorities of the United States, Britain and France in West Berlin against the misuse of the Soviet state flag. Their attention has been drawn to the need to observe most strictly the Quadripartite Agreement.

ZIMYANIN, STUKALIN MEET BCP AGITPROP VISITORS

PM070827 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] A delegation of BCP party workers headed by S. Nikolov, deputy chief of the BCP Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Section, was in the Soviet Union 28 March through 1 April under the plan for CPSU-BCP interparty cooperation.

The Bulgarian comrades familiarized themselves with the CPSU's experience of ideological work aimed at resolving the problems of intensification of production. They had meetings and talks in the CPSU Central Committee propaganda section and Voronezh CPSU Obkom and familiarized themselves with the work practice of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom and Obkom House of Political Enlightenment and a number of party committees, enterprises and economic organizations.

The delegation was received by M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who had a warm, friendly talk with them, with the participation of B.I. Stukalin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Section.

TALYZIN ATTENDS HUNGARIAN LIBERATION OBSEQUIES

PM061939 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Fraternal Hungary's Holiday"]

[Excerpts] The close ties between the Soviet and Hungarian peoples are characterized by common revolutionary traditions and unswerving loyalty to the principle of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. This was stressed at a 1 April ceremonial meeting of representatives of Moscow's working people devoted to the 38th anniversary of Hungary's liberation from fascism.

Taking part in the meeting were I.V. Usmanhodzhayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; N.V. Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; leaders of a number of ministries and departments, military leaders and representatives of party, soviet and public organizations. A delegation from the Hungarian-Soviet Friendship Society was present.

On the same day, S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR, held a reception on the noteworthy anniversary. It was attended by I.V. Usmanhodzhayev, N.V. Talyzin and other officials.

III. 11 Apr 83

U S S R I N T E R N A T I O N A L A F F A I R S
WESTERN EUROPE

G 1

SOVIET SPOKESMAN ON FUTURE OF TIES WITH FRANCE

PM111004 Paris LE MONDE in French 10-11 Apr 83 P 6

[Michel Tatu dispatch: "Moscow: France Has Just Destroyed Its Privileged Position"]

[Excerpts] Moscow [no date given] -- There is growing irritation in Moscow with France after the expulsion measures taken by Paris against the Soviet diplomats.

With regard to political relations, a semi-official Soviet spokesman said that France "has just destroyed the privileged position which it nonetheless enjoyed in the panoply of Soviet foreign policy." The same man added, of course, that the Moscow government "will not fall into the trap" which Paris has allegedly laid for it and that it will keep in mind the long-term future of relations with France, which "will not always be Mr Mitterrand's France."

UNESCO EMPLOYEES AMONG SOVIETS EXPELLED

NC091445 Paris AFP in English 1433 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Excerpt] Paris, April 9 (AFP) -- Nine members of the Soviet delegation to UNESCO, including Ambassador Yuriy Khilchevsky and Deputy Permanent Delegate Jacob Ostrovskiy, were among the 47 Soviets expelled from France Tuesday, an informed source said here today.

Three Soviet members of the Secretariat of the Paris-based United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization were also part of the group expelled by the French Government on charges of espionage in high technology sector of the country's industry and Armed Forces, the source said.

The expulsion order hit most of the dozen members in the Soviet Union's permanent delegation to UNESCO, who are designated by their own country and enjoy diplomatic status.

International civil servants at the UNESCO Secretariat are generally recommended by their home countries, but must be approved by organization officials.

The source said the three Soviet members of the Secretariat worked in UNESCO's translation, accounting, and personnel divisions.

UNESCO has refused all comment on the affair.

In Moscow, meanwhile, the Soviet Communist youth newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA today said France should "be ashamed" for what it called its "arbitrary" decision to expel the Soviet nationals.

The article from Paris also asked whether Washington may not have pressured Paris to take the measure. It was the first commentary in the Soviet press on the affair.

"Those who started an anti-Soviet campaign reminiscent of the cold war should be ashamed," the daily wrote.

III. 11 Apr 83

G 2

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
WESTERN EUROPE

"Who wants the return to an icy era on the [words indistinct] to deploy there, in a mood of anti-Soviet hysteria, new nuclear missiles?" it asked. "The response is unequivocal; it will benefit the United States and its current leaders."

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA also criticized what it called the speed of the expulsions, charging that two people on the list had already left France.

It said the action was "as foreign to the French people as it is outrageous to us" after a period of bilateral relations that "served the cause of consolidating peace in Europe and in the world."

'BANDITS' ATTACK SOVIET BUILDINGS IN FRANCE

Marseilles Consulate

LD091132 Moscow TASS in English 1018 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Text] Paris April 9 TASS -- Unidentified persons fired at the building of the Soviet Consulate in Marseilles last night, FRANCE PRESSE reports with reference to "reliable sources". Traces of 13 bullets were found on the facade of the building. The criminals managed to escape.

Additional Reportage

LD091808 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Apr 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] A bandit attack was carried out today against the Soviet General Consulate in Marseilles. Shots were fired at it from a car. Fourteen shots were fired at the building of the General Consulate. No one was hurt. As a result of the shooting at the building, the General Consulate was damaged significantly. The USSR Embassy in France has made a decisive protest to the French Ministry of External Relations.

Aeroflot Office

LD101511 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Text] Paris April 10 TASS -- A bandit attack was carried out today on the Aeroflot office in Marseilles. Unidentified gunmen fired at its building. There are no casualties. Considerable material damage was inflicted on the building as a result of the attack.

FRENCH 'INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITY' IN AFRICA CITED

LD091233 Moscow TASS IN English 1224 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Text] Paris April 9 TASS -- Along with such espionage centres as the American C.I.A. and Israeli Mossad, the French intelligence service is displaying busy activity in the African continent, first of all in the countries which previously were under French colonial domination.

III. 11 Apr 83

G 3

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
WESTERN EUROPE

According to the Paris-based magazine JEUNE AFRIQUE, French agents have had a hand in most of the plots and the overthrows of governments that have taken place in French-speaking Africa over the recent period.

The French intelligence agencies are showing "special attention" to the countries which have opted for independent development in particular, the Congo, Benin and Mali.

The Paris newspaper LE MONDE reported that the French intelligence service gives active assistance to the special services in the states ruled by pro-Western regimes and supervises the raising there of special forces for suppressing actions by the opposition. Besides, it has staff members posing as "technical advisers and specialists" implanted in government institutions in many African countries. Their task is to facilitate the keeping of Africa back in the state of neocolonial subordination.

The African press describes cooperation between the secret services of France and South Africa as "particularly deplorable". LE MONDE admitted that Paris and Pretoria maintain regular exchanges of "confidential" information. Even way back during the Angolan people's armed struggle for independence French agents supplied the apartheid regime with data about the situation in Angola.

The activities conducted by the French intelligence service in Africa received a fresh impetus in 1981 when an effort was launched to reorganise France's espionage network in Africa with a view to improving its operational efficiency.

The main "novelty" introduced in the framework of the reorganisation effort has been the active use in organising secret operations in Africa of links between France and highly placed officials in some African countries along the lines of so-called "Masonic solidarity". A list of the African personalities, who are members of Masonic lodges, has been compiled. All of them, JEUNE AFRIQUE said, are regarded as "potential agents" of the French intelligence service.

USSR CITES BOOKS ON CIA ACTIVITIES IN EUROPE

'Open Secret'

LD071643 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 7 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS -- TASS commentator Vladimir Malyshev writes:

The U.S. secret services have enmeshed the countries of Western Europe in a dense cobweb of terror and provocations. The U.S. ruling circles are hell-bent on subordinating the West European states to their diktat, preventing a democratic change, on poisoning the atmosphere of cooperation in Europe. Numerous crimes perpetrated by the American "knights of cloak and dagger" in Italy, Spain, Greece and Portugal in recent years are generally known. The CIA's intrigues against France are also an open secret. They are disclosed in particular in the book "Les Urais Maitres Du Monde" (The Real Masters of the World) by Luis M. Gonzales Mata. The author of the book was in the past a ranking Spanish secret service official and had access to materials exposing many dirty operations by the American espionage department.

Luis Gonzales Mato writes on how the CIA agents had used extremist groupings for struggle against....General de Gaulle, whose refusal to follow blindly into the footsteps of the U.S. policy did not suit Washington's book.

The reader is sure to remember, L.M. Gonzales Mata points out, the events of 1968, which swept Western Europe and brought to light the generation gap, the crisis of the whole capitalist system, which dooms wide sections of young people to unemployment. In France these events were on a particular scale and of an extraordinary intensity. But it is by far less known how the American secret services capitalised on these events, seeing in the "student revolution" a rare opportunity to deal a telling blow to French President Charles de Gaulle, the man who had for many years increasingly displayed a persistent striving for national independence. President de Gaulle, who from the CIA's viewpoint was dangerous, is known to have declared for France's withdrawal from the NATO's military wing and for pursuance by France of an independent foreign policy.

As L.M. Gonzales Mata writes in the book on his work at the secret service after arriving in Paris he contacted Colonel Graham, who was responsible for the coordination of activities by the stationary agents of the CIA and the U.S. military intelligence in France. The latter's headquarters was at that time near the U.S. Embassy building.

"The point is by no means to assist the left-wing forces in coming to power," Graham said, "it is necessary that our friends should plant themselves into the groups of activists, instigate demonstrators to incidents with the law enforcement bodies. This will cause a reaction among the silent majority and the bourgeoisie who, feeling danger, will in the final analysis make De Gaulle change his policy, shun the countries of the East and return to the alliance with the United States," Graham said.

The CIA succeeded with the assistance of its stationary agents to heighten tensions to such a degree that De Gaulle ordered the evacuation of government archives and left Paris on May 29. Later he returned, but was forced to retire for several months. Thus, L.M. Gonzales Mata concludes, the CIA carried out an operation for the removal of a political figure, who was trying to pursue a policy of independence from the USA.

In recent years the CIA has been even more actively operating in France. According to the American COVERT ACTION journal, the U.S. Embassy in Paris is one of the key branches of the U.S. espionage department abroad, which devotes special attention to the countries of Western Europe, where a powerful movement of protest has unfolded against Washington's aggressive plans, against the deployment of new American nuclear missiles. To implement its plans for the militarisation of Western Europe, the CIA is doing its utmost in an attempt to prevent the development of relations with the socialist states and poison the climate of detente. It is precisely with that aim that agents of the U.S. espionage department, who entrenched themselves in Europe, including in France, have been staging ever new and ever more heinous provocations. Their intrigues are particularly dangerous also because the CIA operates in France, as the press notes, in an atmosphere of absolute impunity, with the connivance of certain influential circles.

'The CIA's Dirty Work'

LD071033 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0450 GMT 7 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr (TASS) -- "CIA agents feel at home in many West European capitals" says a KOMMUNIST review of an anthology of materials published in the USSR under the title "The CIA's Dirty Work in West Europe" [Gryznaya Rabota TsRU v Zapadnoy Yevrope]

The compilers of the anthology are former CIA employee P. Agee and American publicist L. Wolf [name as transliterated]. The evidence in the anthology under review, the fifth issue of the journal notes, constitutes an indignant accusation against those who have made open piracy a norm of conduct in the international arena.

Naturally the activities of the CIA are concealed behind slogans of struggle against the "Red Menace" and "International Communism". As P. Agee writes, this is "a most persistent myth" used by the CIA to cover up its interference in the internal affairs of foreign states. However, the book emphasizes, the gathering and processing of intelligence data about the USSR and its allies are by no means the only task of the CIA.

The materials of the manual lead the reader to the conclusion that the CIA also strikes at "its own."

In France, for example, the Washington agency interferes in the affairs of political organizations, infiltrates its spies in them, aims to influence Paris' foreign policy course, and engages in industrial and economic espionage. The CIA has penetrated deeply into French intelligence and counterintelligence bodies and has recruited numerous informers there, mainly by using bribery.

"Just as the past, the present sordid affairs of the CIA also confirm that this shock detachment of American hegemonism stops at nothing to achieve its mercenary aims. All is grist to its will, and this must never be forgotten", the journal KOMMUNIST writes.

UK'S PYM 'WORKING AS ONE' WITH U.S. IN MIDEAST

LD080534 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 7 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS -- (?TASS) commentator Grigory Vasilyev writes: The British Foreign Secretary Francis Pym is leaving for a new tour of several Persian Gulf countries. Touching on the aims of this trip the British GUARDIAN notes that one of them is to try to breathe new life into Reagan's Middle East plan.

The progressive press in the Middle East countries has repeatedly noted what the so called "Reagan plan" is to bring the peoples and countries of the region: perpetuation of the Israeli occupation of Arab lands, division of Arab ranks, isolation of the Arab countries, and their subordination to the American-Israeli diktat. In accordance with these aims and with the active assistance of Israel, its partner in the anti-Arab "strategic alliance", Washington is steadily expanding its (?network of military) bases in the Middle East and creating new bridgeheads of aggression, resorting in the process to rude pressure and interference in the affairs of sovereign Arab states.

Judging by everything, Francis Pym will have to play the role of a conduit of Washington's pro-Israeli policy, to prepare the ground for subsequent visits to Arab countries by high-placed representatives of the American Administration. By working as one with Washington and trying to determine the directions along which pressure is to be put subsequently on the Arab capitals, the British envoy is actually assisting the fulfillment of plans that have nothing in common with the cause of a just Middle East settlement and run counter to the interests of the Arab peoples.

III. 11 Apr 83

G 6

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
WESTERN EUROPE

BELGIAN FOREIGN MINISTER, DELEGATION IN USSR

Foreign Minister's Arrival Noted

LD101433 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Text] Belgian Foreign Minister Tindemans arrived in Moscow today on a short working visit. He was met at the airport by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Kovalev and other officials. Among those who met him was the Belgian Ambassador to the USSR, Taelemans.

Parliamentarians Tour Moscow

LD062129 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 6 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS -- A delegation of the Belgian Parliament headed by President of the Senate Edwards Leemans and President of the Chamber of Representatives Jean Defraigne paid a visit to the USSR Supreme Soviet today.

Vitaliy Ruben, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, one of the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, told the guests about the efforts of the Soviet state, its parliament aimed at the preservation of peace, at the prevention of the danger of nuclear catastrophe. The importance of interparliamentary contacts making it possible to clarify the stands of the sides on many problems, including questions of the struggle for peace, was pointed out.

The Belgian parliamentaries placed a wreath at the unknown soldier's tomb at the Kremlin Wall. "This is the tribute to the memory of the 20 million Soviet people who gave their lives for the freedom of their motherland. This is a high evaluation of the Soviet Union's contribution to the victory in the Second World War", Edwards Leemans said. "We in Belgium know the value of peace and declare for positive results of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva."

On the same day the Belgian parliamentarians were received at the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Soviet.

The Muscovites, just as all the Soviet people, welcome the development of Soviet-Belgian relations at all levels, Vladimir Promyslov, the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Soviet, said at the meeting.

"The contacts between Moscow and Brussels contribute to the strengthening of relations between the Soviet Union and Belgium," Promyslov went on. "We are heartened by the fact that the ties between the two capitals established in 1979 were strengthened considerably of late. The meetings with representatives of Brussels invariably show mutual understanding, the striving for ever more effective cooperation between the people of both cities."

USSR'S SAFRONCHUK MEETS WITH IRANIAN OFFICIAL

GF081612 Tehran IRNA in English 1550 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] Tehran, April 8, IRNA -- Vasiliy Safronchuk, director of the Middle East Department of the Soviet Union Foreign Ministry, met and conferred with Hoseyn Sheykh ol-Eslam, deputy foreign minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran, here Thursday.

In that meeting talks on mutual ties, the expansion of economic relations and the grounds for cooperation on joint schemes were held. Also regional and international problems were discussed.

AEROFLOT TO RESUME FLIGHTS TO TEHRAN 5 MAY

LD111059 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0905 GMT on 11 April carries an unnamed correspondent's report from Sheremetyevo Airport, Moscow, in which he reports the inaugural flight by Aeroflot on the Moscow-Buenos Aires-Moscow route.

Addressing journalists at the airport, Boris Yegorovich Panyukov, USSR first deputy minister of civil aviation, says that starting this summer wide-bodied IL-86 aircraft will be flying to Berlin four times a week due to constantly growing demands. The IL-86 will also be making regular flights on the routes Moscow-Frankfurt Am Main, Moscow-Sofia twice a week, and on the Moscow-Berlin and Moscow-Hanoi routes. "On 5 May flights to Tehran will resume. Preparations are under way for inaugurating flights to Valletta in Malta and Male in the Maldives Republic." It is planned to inaugurate regular IL-86 flights to Athens and Prague.

USSR, IRAQ EXCHANGE TREATY ANNIVERSARY TELEGRAMS

LD082237 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1950 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers have sent a telegram to Husayn, chairman of the Revolution Command Council and president of the Republic of Iraq, in which they convey to him and to all Iraqi people congratulations on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Iraq. This treaty is appraised in the telegram as an important factor in the cause of strengthening the friendly links and the mutually beneficial cooperation between our countries.

For his part, the president of Iraq confirms in his telegram the sincere wishes for further developing and strengthening the ties of friendship and cooperation between our countries.

CPSU CC POLITBURO EXAMINES USSR ENERGY PROGRAM

PM110931 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 83 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo"]

[Text] The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee at its regular meeting examined the draft long-term energy program of the USSR, which had been drawn up on the basis of the decisions of the 26th party congress and the subsequent plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee. The USSR's energy program is called upon to ensure the solution of the prime strategic task of the country's long-term economic development, which consists in effecting the structural, technical, and organizational-economic restructuring of the country's economy with a view to switch it in the shortest possible period of time to the road of intensive and energy-saving development.

The program was elaborated on the basis of computations concerning the main indicators of the USSR's economic and social development in the period running up to the year 2000, proceeding from the need to resolve the problems facing the country in this period and taking into account the achieved production, scientific, and technological potential.

The energy program of the USSR is directed at perfecting the structure of the country's energy budget, accelerating the development of the atomic power industry, including fast reactors, and continuing the quest for new energy sources. It envisions measures to further increase the production of oil and gas in western Siberia, to ensure their transportation to the country's European part, and steadily to enhance the effectiveness of the fuel-and-energy complex by introducing the latest achievements of science and technology and creating a dependable system of saving energy and resources.

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee emphasized that to further develop the fuel-and-energy complex, to perfect the energy budget, to increase labor productivity in the production of energy resources on the basis of the introduction of the latest achievements of science and technology, and to secure rational and economical use of fuel and energy are the most important tasks of the party, soviet and economic bodies, trade union and Kosmomol organisations, and all the working people of the Soviet Union.

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee discussed at the meeting the question of the fulfillment of contractual obligations as regards the shipments of products and of increasing the responsibility in these matters of the ministries, departments, and enterprises. During the discussion it was stressed that given the present scale of social production and the breadth of production sharing and specialization, stable economic ties and the strict fulfillment by enterprises and organizations of targets for the supply of output in the set quantities and ranges are the most important condition for the further development and efficient operation of the national economy as a whole and of all its links. Measures were determined for introducing order and discipline in the fulfillment of contractual obligations regarding output deliveries.

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee examined the question of the procedure of introducing and adopting proposals for the development of individual sectors and economic districts, whose implementation calls for big capital investments. Provisions were made for a closer linkage of such proposals with the shaping of the long-term and current economic and social development plans, their thorough consideration, coordination, and provision with the necessary resources.

III. 11 Apr 83

R 2

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS
POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee also discussed at its meeting questions of further developing the existing legislation on work collectives and enhancing their role in managing enterprises, offices and organizations.

MINISTERS DISMISSED; NEW APPOINTMENTS MADE

LD090931 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade Vladimir Fedorovich Zhigalin of his post of Minister of Heavy and Transport Machine Building in accordance with his own request on grounds of health. The Presidium has appointed Comrade Sergey Aleksandrovich Afanasyet minister of heavy and transport machine building of the USSR, having freed him from the post of minister of general machine building of the USSR. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov minister of general machine building of the USSR.

Politburo Expresses Gratitude

LD091352 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Vladimir Fedorovich from the post of USSR minister of heavy and transport machine building in accordance with his own request on grounds of health. The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee has expressed gratitude to Comrade Zhigalin, in connection with his retirement, for his conscientious labor for the good of the party and people.

Labor Committee Chairman Replaced

LD111114 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 11 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow, 11 Apr (TASS) -- The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Vladimir Lomonosov from his duties as chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems because of his transfer to other work. Yuriy Batalin has been appointed chairman of the committee.

Batalin was born in 1927. By education, he is a civil engineer and has worked in various leading posts in construction organizations for the oil and gas industry in Bashkiria and West Siberia. For the past 10 years, he has been first deputy USSR minister of construction of petroleum and gas industry enterprises.

Estonian Supreme Soviet Change

LD081649 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] Tallinn April 8 TASS -- Arnold Ryuytel was today elected president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia at the session of this Soviet republic's parliament that is being held in Tallinn. His predecessor, Ivan Kebin, who had worked for more than thirty years as first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia and then president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic, has retired.

III. 11 Apr 83

R 3

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS
POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Arnold Ryuytel was born to a peasant family in 1928 on Saaremaa Island of the Moonsund Archipelago. He is a graduate of the Estonian Agricultural Academy.

Prior to his election, he was first deputy chairman of Estonia's Council of Ministers.

OBITUARY OF KOLKHOZ ORGANIZER RELEASED

Biography Given

LD081543 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] Proskovya Andreyevna Malinina, a major organizer of kolkhoz construction in our country, a member of the Union Kolkhoz Council, honorary chairman of the 12 October Kolkhoz, Kostroma Rayon, died on 7 April after a long serious illness. Under her leadership that kolkhoz grew into one of the best leading farms in the country.

Proskovya Andreyevna Malinina was a member of the CPSU for over 40 years; she was a delegate to many CPSU congresses, took an active part in the country's social and political life, and was elected as deputy of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet for six convocations. The Communist Party and the Soviet Government, says the obituary signed by leaders of the party and the state and eminent agricultural workers, had a high assessment of the services of Proskovya Andreyevna Malinina. She was twice awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor, honored with six Orders of Lenin, two Orders of Labor Red Banner, and also many medals.

Her great love of labor, distinctive organizational talent as economic manager and selfless devotion to the Leninist behests on building a new life in the countryside will serve as a bright example for many generations of kolkhoz peasantry. The bright memory of Proskovya Andreyevna Malinina, a loyal daughter of the Communist Party and the socialist homeland, will be preserved forever in our hearts.

Signatories of Obituary

PM11053 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 9 April First Edition carries on page 3 an obituary of twice Hero of Socialist Labor P.A. Malinina; the PRAVDA report adds the following list of signatories:

"Yu.V. Andropov, M.S. Gorbachev, N.A. Tikhonov, K.U. Chernenko, V.V. Kuznetsov, M.S. Solomentsev, I.V. Kapitonov, Z.N. Nuriyev, G.F. Sizov, Yu.N. Balandin, V.A. Karlov, V.K. Mesyats, L.B. Yerminev, N.Ye. Kruchina, I.K. Kapustyan, V.(?I). Nikonov, K.V. Dontsov, N.I. (?Berezkin), G.A. Goryachev, P.T. Zadorzhnyy, A.I. Kuznetsov, V.A. Tupichenkov, A.P. Chubarov, A.V. Titalov, M.Kh. Savchenko, G.I. Tkachuk, and V.Z. Tur."

PRAVDA OUTLINES CONTENTS OF KOMMUNIST NO 5

PM081525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 83 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Journal's Latest Issue"]

[Text] The fifth issue of the CPSU Central Committee's theoretical and political journal KOMMUNIST has been published.

III. 11 Apr 83

R 4

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS
POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

It publishes a new K. Marx document, Yu.V. Andropov's answers to a PRAVDA correspondent's questions, and an article by Academician A. Yegorov, director of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, "A Mighty Instrument of Scientific Knowledge and Revolutionary Action."

Under the rubric "The 26th CPSU Congress -- The Development of Marxist-Leninist Theory", the articles "Scientific and Technical Progress and Transformations in the Sphere of Labor" by B. Rakitskiy; and "Components of Social Justice" by V. Davidovich are published.

The section "Horizons of Science" publishes the articles "Ethnic Processes in the USSR" by Acad Yu. Bromley; and "The Latest Tasks of Soviet Geography" by N. Agafonov, V. (?Apuchin), and S. Lavrov.

The journal publishes the articles "Who Is Really in Front?" by V. Cherfas; "Consistent Internationalist" by S. Velenkov; "Outstanding Revolutionary and Thinker" by V. Bogorad; and "A Realistic Program for Curbing the Arms Race" by A. Chernyshev.

IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL MARKS BOLSHEVIK ANNIVERSARY

PM081455 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Apr 83 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Along the Road of Great Achievements"]

[Text] At the dawn of the 20th century, the great Lenin said proudly and prophetically: "Give us a revolutionary organization, and we will transform Russia!"

Lenin devoted his genius and indomitable energy to the creation of the Communist Party, which was to unite all the strength of the emergent proletariat with all the strength of the Russian revolutionaries and to which, as Vladimir Ilich put it, everything living and honest in Russia would be drawn. The Second Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress, which opened on 30 July 1903 and which created the Bolshevik Party, completed the process of the unification of Russia's revolutionary Marxist organizations on ideological, political, and organizational principles formulated by V.I. Lenin. A party of a new type -- a party of working class, a party of scientific socialism, a party of socialist revolution, and communist creation -- entered the arena of history.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the 80th Anniversary of the Second Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress" says: "The formation of Lenin's party was the law-governed result of social development and the turning point in the liberation struggle of the Russian and international proletariat." The characteristic and specific features of the new type of party, as this vivid political document stresses, are that it is guided by and creatively develops Marxist-Leninist teaching and ensures the organizational unity of revolutionary theory and practice. It is the working class' collective political leader, the supreme form of working class organization and the vanguard of all working people. The Bolshevik Party headed the liberation struggle of the proletariat and its allies in three Russian revolutions, and led the working masses to the victorious October Revolution. The Great October Socialist Revolution marked a fundamental turning point in mankind's historical destiny.

The path traveled by Lenin's party is a truly heroic path of struggle and victories. Under its guidance, the Soviet land's working people have carried out radical transformations: socialist industrialization, the collectivization of agriculture, and the cultural revolution.

The triumph of the ideas of proletarian internationalism was shown by the creation of the USSR and the comprehensive development of the economy and culture of all the country's nations and ethnic groups. Led by the party, Soviet people won a world-historic victory in the Great Patriotic War against the fascist German invaders and saved the peoples of the world from the threat of fascist enslavement.

The main outcome of the Soviet people's creative activity under the Communist Party's leadership is the building of developed socialism in the USSR. Our country is at the beginning of that law-governed and historically long stage in the establishment of the communist formation. The main activity of the party and people at present is to improve developed socialism.

The Soviet people are now engaged in fulfilling the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and our party's May and November (1982) plenums. The ultimate goal of socialist production is to steadily improve the people's living standards and to create the conditions for the individual's comprehensive development. Concern for Soviet man was and remains our party's general line. In this respect the party stresses that only labor and its results can be the source of everyone's prosperity. The fulfillment of the tasks set by the party requires greater responsibility from working people -- from workers to ministers -- for their allotted area; the establishment of order and organization at all levels of the national economy; and the strengthening of plan, labor, and state discipline.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution reveals the full scale of the party's colossal work aimed at the rapprochement of all classes and social groups in the country and the intensification of social uniformity. A consistent course is being implemented toward the further obliteration of the existing differences between city and country and mental and manual workers. Lenin's party is justly proud of the achievements in the sphere of national relations. The supreme expression of society's social and international unity was provided by the formation and development of a new historical community of people -- the Soviet people.

The consistent development of socialist democracy is an important condition of our society's progress. The transformation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a socialist state of all the people marked a change of tremendous significance for the development of the political system of socialism and people's power. The new USSR Constitution created the legislative basis for deepening Soviet democracy and enriching its forms and methods. Strengthening the material and spiritual bases of the socialist way of life, the CPSU is persistently resolving the tasks of shaping a Marxist-Leninist world outlook among society's members, and of inculcating in them a devotion to the ideals of communism: a sense of being masters of the country, a political and moral culture, and an implacability toward bourgeois ideology and morality.

Our people rightly link all their achievements with the multifaceted activity of the CPSU -- Soviet society's leading and directing force and nucleus of its political system. In the past 80 years it has been transformed from a small organization of Marxist revolutionaries into a mighty cohesive party which now numbers over 18 million Communists. As the party of all the people under conditions of developed socialism, the CPSU retains its class character and by nature remains the party of the working class. Its role in Soviet society's life is increasing steadily.

The party attaches great significance to the comprehensive affirmation of the Leninist work style -- a creative style which ensures a scientific approach to all social process, constant reliance on the masses; a high level of efficiency; specificity, exactingness, and implacability toward all manifestations of formalism, bureaucracy, and mere window dressing.

The party stresses that a tendency toward deeds and not just big words is what is needed now.

The firm unity between the party and the people was and remains the source of Soviet society's indestructibility and the socialist motherland's further prosperity.

The prestige of our party and the Soviet land in the world arena and among the world's working people is great. After all, the CPSU's entire history is a very vivid example of the indissoluble combination of the national with the international. The world socialist system has now become the decisive factor in social progress. The decisive struggle by the CPSU and Soviet state to eliminate colonialism and assistance to and cooperation with national liberation movements have helped to defeat the colonial system. Our party actively supports the liberated peoples' struggle for their political and economic independence and rates highly the Nonaligned Movement. The CPSU struggles consistently and persistently to preserve and consolidate peace. Our party's peace-loving foreign policy and the major initiatives put forward at party congresses, and recently by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, are finding increasing support among the international public.

In preparing to worthily mark the 80th anniversary of the Second Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress -- that portentous date in the history of our party and country -- Soviet people are uniting ever closer around the CPSU and are directing all their creative efforts toward the fulfillment of the decisions of the 26th party congress; subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums; the tasks put forward by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of our party's Central Committee, in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum, in the report "Sixty Years of the USSR," in the article "The Teaching of Karl Marx and Certain Questions of Socialist Building in the USSR" and other speeches and documents.

The Communist Party -- the mind, honor, and conscience of our era -- leads the Soviet people along the road of great new achievements for the good of our motherland and in the name of the triumph of the cause of peace and social progress.

SENTENCE PASSED ON CORRUPT MILITIA PERSONNEL

PM060917 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Apr 83 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent V. Udachin report: "The Bribe-Takers Have Been Punished" under the rubric: "Following Reports in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA"]

[Text] Krasnodar [no date given] -- On 22 March SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reported on legal proceedings in the case of M. Shmatov, former chief of the Gelendzhik City Militia section's department for combatting embezzlement of socialist property, and R. Mitina, former senior inspector in that section. They were accused of repeatedly receiving bribes from personnel of the Gelendzhik restaurant and Canteen trust in return for refraining from action which would have prevented and halted criminal dealings.

The Krasnodar Kray Court Penal Division under the chairmanship of Yu.F. Tyshchenko, member of the Kray Court, carefully studied material relating to the case during the examination and passed a guilty verdict against the bribetakers. Shmatov was sentenced to 11 years' deprivation of liberty with the sentence to be served in a corrective labor colony under intensified regime, and Mitina to 8 years' deprivation of liberty with the sentence to be served in a corrective labor colony under standard regime. Their personal property has been confiscated.

PARTY, STATE DECISION ON AGRICULTURE ADOPTED

LD091712 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 9 Apr 83

[From the Vremya Newscast]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have adopted a decision on measures to further raise the technical standard and quality of machinery and equipment for agriculture, improving the utilization and increasing their production and supply in 1983-90. In the period since the March 1965 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the decision notes, the supply of machinery to kolkhozes and sovkhozes has increased considerably and there has been a considerable renewal of the complement of the machinery and tractor pool. The power-labor ratio of agriculture has increased by more than threefold. At the same time certain machinery and equipment produced for agriculture still fails to meet completely modern demands and there are serious shortcomings in the use of machinery on the farms.

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have set tasks for USSR ministries and departments which produce machinery and equipment for agriculture in order to raise their technical standard and quality and to increase their production and supply in 1983-90.

The aforementioned ministries and departments are given the task, in particular, of considerably improving the technical and economic indices of machinery and equipment and of implementing in a planned manner the transition to the production and supply of systems and sets of machinery and technological lines to provide for the integrated mechanization of basic and auxiliary work. A complex of measures has been approved which are aimed at reducing the length of time to design and begin production of new equipment.

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have made it incumbent on the central committees and the councils of ministers of union republics, kraykoms and obkoms, ministries and departments, councils of ministers of autonomous republics, kray committees and oblispolkoms to regard the implementation of the tasks and measures set out in the decision as a matter of primary importance and great economic and political significance. The top leaders of the appropriate ministries, departments, local organs, associations, establishments and organizations bear personal responsibility for this.

A detailed account of the decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers is published in the press.

PRAVDA ON GRAIN CROP SITUATION, FOOD PROGRAM

PM082037 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 83 First Edition p 1

["Agricultural Review" by "USSR Ministry of Agriculture Specialists": "Helping the Grain Field"]

[Text] Even experienced grain growers, who have given many years of their lives to labor on the land, cannot recall such a fast onset of spring. The unusually warm weather which has settled over a large part of the country's territory has all at once "included" hundreds of thousands of seeding and soil-treatment units in the work schedules. Spring is pushing on and the farmer is in a hurry. He has much to cope with: first and foremost to retain moisture in the soil and then to fertilize the plowland well, seed it with good quality seeds and feed the winter crops in good time.

And the days available for this work are few.

Gross yields of grain and other crops must increase significantly in the current year, as envisaged by the Food Program. A special role in the accomplishment of this task has been assigned to winter crop sowings. They have always provided the farmer with guaranteed grain because they have used, better than the spring crops, the moisture reserves accumulated in the soil during the fall. That is, of course, provided that the farmer has helped them by strictly observing the requirements of agriculture science.

It is known to all that last year was not the best year for winter crops. Nevertheless, the farms that introduced scientifically determined farming systems and managed to overcome the vagaries of nature did not incur losses. Last summer the Krupskaya Kolkhoz in Crimean Oblast's Nizhnegorskiy Rayon harvested almost 60 quintals of winter wheat on average. The Kalinin Kolkhoz in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast's Novomoskovskiy Rayon harvested 58.5 quintals per hectare and the Kavkaz Kolkhoz in Krasnodar Kray's Kurganinskiy Rayon harvested 56.4 quintals per hectare. The Kanash Kolkhoz in the Chuvash ASSR and the Padomyu Latiyya Kolkhoz in the Latvian SSR harvested 45 quintals of winter rye per hectare. This means that similar yields are within the capabilities of many other farms.

The growth of grain output largely depends on the successful completion of spring sowing and the exemplary tending of winter crops. Nowadays kolkhozes and sovkhoses have at their disposal sufficient quantities of mineral fertilizers to feed all areas sown to winter crops.

Of course, winter crops have not survived intact everywhere. Some of them will have to be partly or completely resown. In such cases the diagnosis of the agronomical service must be exceptionally accurate. Reseeding must be undertaken only in those sectors where the winter crops harvest is expected to be lower than that for spring crops. And they must be sown with only the most productive grain strains.

Taking advantage of the warm weather, the rural toilers have embarked on organized tending of winter crops. Out of the total area to be harvested this year, top dressing of crops has been carried out on a total area of 25.3 million hectares, including 12 million hectares on farms in the Russian Federation and 8 million hectares in the Ukraine. All winter crops have already received their mineral dressing in Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan. Alma-Ata, Chimkent and Dzhambul Oblasts were the first in Kazakhstan to complete the dressing of crops. The pilots of the agricultural aviation service are a great help to the country's farmers. They have dressed from the air over 9 million hectares of winter crops.

In many areas the care of winter and spring crop fields has been undertaken by teams and links which have introduced the contract forms of labor organization and remuneration. There is convincing practical evidence that the subdivisions which have transferred to the collective contract system produce high labor indicators.

Especially well coordinated and organized work has been done in the past few days by farmers in Orel Oblast's Glazunovskiy Rayon. The team contract system has been a reliable assistant here. It was introduced here 2 years ago. The links which have transferred to the new form of labor organization and remuneration have been allocated crop rotation fields and equipment, and the obligations of financially autonomous subdivisions and of farm administrations have been clearly defined. And the result: Grain yields have increased by 4 quintals compared with the 10th 5-Year Plan and the gross yield of agricultural produce has increased significantly.

The team contract method and the implementation of real financial autonomy are a most important reserve for farmers, allowing them to raise the speed and quality of work in winter and spring field work. Rayon agroindustrial association councils are called upon to disseminate more broadly the experience of leading contract collectives and make farm leaders and specialists more responsible for its introduction. It is important to execute precisely the contracts concluded between contract subdivisions and farm administrations; the links and detachments must be assured of having all they need; they must be allocated their share of machines, supplied with mineral fertilizers and plant protection chemicals and assured of fuel and lubricant supplies.

Meanwhile, local reports indicate that not all farms in the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan have received mineral fertilizers in time. A considerable share of the blame for this lies with the subdivisions of Soyuzselkhozkhimiya. Their employees knew how much mineral fertilizer and of what type would be needed to dress the winter crops and apply it simultaneously with the seeds, but have been slack in monitoring fertilizer shipments and have been late with deliveries to farms. The field workers have also been let down by some collectives of chemical industry enterprises. The Rossoshi chemical plant, the Berezhniki nitrogen fertilizer plant and the Tolyattiazot and Permnefteorgsintez production associations are still in arrears. The leaders of Selkhozkhimiya associations and mineral fertilizer enterprises must eliminate the shortcomings quickly and, jointly with the farms' agronomical services, make sure that all winter crops receive the necessary feed. It is also important to produce and deliver to rural areas in good time the mineral fertilizers which the farmers will need for application in the later stages of growth of winter crops, thus helping to significantly improve grain quality.

Each day the scale of spring field work is expanding. More and more regions are starting to sow spring crops. In early April they have been sown over an area of more than 15 million hectares. Much effort is being made by agricultural workers in these days to sow the fields within the best agrotechnical time limits and to a high standard of work. They are well aware that bountifulness of the fields and the successful realization of the country's Food Program depends on their shock labor.

BRIEFS

AZERBAIJAN COTTON CULTIVATION -- Cultivation of cotton has begun in Azerbaijan SSR. Cotton is an important part of Azerbaijan's rural economy. During the past two 5-year development plan periods, cotton yield increased significantly and over 1 million tons of cotton have been harvested in Azerbaijan for the first time in the republic's cotton cultivation sector. Cotton yield increased threefold during the past 13 years in Azerbaijan. Numerous regions now specialize in cotton cultivation. Meanwhile, over 200,000 pieces of machinery are being used in the rural economy sector and a significant portion of that amount consists of cotton harvesting machines. [Baku International Service in Azeri 1300 GMT 5 Apr 83 GF]

UZBEK RICE CULTIVATION -- The Uzbek Ministry of Agriculture has informed a Tashkent radio correspondent that cultivation of rice has begun throughout Uzbekistan. A number of specialized farms are using tractors capable of sowing rice. Uzbekistan, which produces one-fifth of the rice produced in the Soviet Union, currently harvests 80 centers from every hectare of rice field. The development program for rice in the current 5-year plan is being successfully realized. [Text] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 6 Apr 83 GF]

III. 11 Apr 83

U S S R N A T I O N A L A F F A I R S
S C I E N T I F I C A F F A I R S

U I

USSR LAUNCHES COSMOS, COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES

Cosmos-1451

LD081524 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS -- The "Cosmos-1451" artificial satellite of the Earth was launched in the Soviet Union today.

It carries scientific equipment intended for continuing studies of outer space.

The sputnik has an initial period of revolution of 88.7 minutes, a maximum distance from the surface of the earth of 264 kilometres, and a minimum distance from the surface of the Earth of 194 kilometres. The inclination of its orbit is 82.3 degrees.

The equipment on board the sputnik is operating normally.

'Raduga' Satellite

LD081527 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT 8 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS -- The Soviet Union has put into orbit today another communication satellite of the "Raduga" series carrying relay equipment to ensure telephone and telegraph radio links and to relay T.V. programs.

The satellite has been put into a near-stationary circular orbit with the initial parameters:

-- Distance from the Earth surface -- 35,870 km;

-- Period of revolution -- 24 hours;

-- Inclination of the orbit -- 1.3 degrees.

The equipment carried by the satellite is operating normally. The ground control complex is controlling the satellite. The relay and T.V. equipment of the satellite will be operated in accordance with the preset program.

SOVIET ROLE IN KOSPAS-SARSAT SYSTEM DETAILED

PM110921 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 83 Morning Edition p 3

[Scientific observer B. Konovalov article: "Space Helps Sailors"]

[Excerpts] The shipwreck appeared stunningly prosaic. A small cone-shaped distress buoy was "seated" on an ordinary office chair beside a gaily babbling spring brook.

"It doesn't look much like a shipwreck, does it?" -- Engineer Eduard Aliyevich Goncharov guessed my thoughts. "Of course, this is a laboratory stimulation. Various types of marine and aircraft buoys are now being tested. In the event of an accident they are to send a distress signal to satellites of the KOSPAS-SARSAT system, which has been developed through the joint efforts of the USSR, the United States, France and Canada. KOSPAS is the Soviet part of the system. The name means 'Space System for Seeking Ships (and Aircraft) in Distress.' And SARSAT is the acronym for the foreign part of the project -- 'Search and Rescue by Means of Satellite Detection.' Last year and at the beginning of this year all four countries involved in the international project tried out the system with the help of the Soviet Cosmos-1383 satellite. On 24 March it was joined by another of our satellites -- Cosmos-1447. And on 28 March the first American satellite was put into orbit. In approximately 1 month's time it is to be made available to all the parties to the project. A whole number of our own and foreign control buoys are now working at the stage of checking out the system. We have both stationary and mobile buoys. For example, we are tracking buoys located on board the ship Professor Vize, which is now in the region of Antarctica, and the ship Admiral Vladimirovskiy, which is making a round-the-world Antarctic voyage."

In the process of checking out the system with the help of the Soviet Cosmos-1383 satellite real assistance has already been given in many instances to aircraft and ships in distress. Sixteen lives have been saved. The rescue satellites operate on two frequencies -- 121.5 megahertz, on which information is gathered from aircraft buoys (there are already approximately 200,000 of them), and 406.1 megahertz, allocated to marine buoys. Tests of the buoys on the frequency of 121.5 megahertz have shown that with the satellite's help the coordinates of an accident are determined with an accuracy quite acceptable to existing search and rescue services. On the frequency of 406.1 megahertz it is possible to determine the position of an accident with an accuracy of some 2-3 km. But in various parts of the world there is radio interference for distress signals on this frequency. The test work is now being extended. Britain and Norway are joining the KOSPAS-SARSAT international system, and Bulgaria and Japan are preparing to join in the work.

Last fall I talked with Prof Jean-Claude (Yusson), director of Toulouse Space Center. He was extremely pleased with the work of the Soviet rescue satellite.

"Space cooperation in this sphere is very important," Professor (Yusson) said. "We have all saved a lot of time and money by at once creating an international system with coordinated technical parameters. Therefore the work of different countries has all fitted together well. The pooling of efforts in the utilization of space serves the interests of all people on earth, and we are pleased that effective East-West businesslike cooperation has now been organized."

The stage of demonstrating and evaluating the KOSPAS-SARSAT satellite system is to be completed in 1983, and the most efficient distress buoys will be selected for mass production. And it seems that the satellite rescue system will then be operated within the framework of the International Organization for Maritime Telecommunications by Satellites -- INMARSAT.

"This organization unites 38 states," Yuriy Sergeyevich Atserov, chief of the Morsvyazsputnik all-union association under the USSR Ministry of Maritime Fleet, said. "Some 85 percent of the world tonnage of ships belongs to INMARSAT member-countries. The satellite rescue system could become an organic part of this international organization, in whose work our association representing the USSR takes an active part."

A station has now been set up on the shore of the Khadzhibeyevskiy Lagoon 20 km from Odessa to communicate with sea-going ships via satellites belonging to INMARSAT. The official handover of the station's apparatus to representatives of this international organization is currently taking place before the start of its commercial operation. One of the Odessa station's 13 meter-diameter parabolic antennas will be aimed at the Mareks, a satellite located above the Atlantic's equatorial zone at 26 degrees west. The dish of the second antenna will watch the INTELSAT V satellite suspended above the Indian Ocean at 63 degrees east. Two-way ship-to-shore telephone, telegraph, phototelegraph, and telex communications will be maintained via these satellites. The Odessa station has been plugged into the USSR's land internal and international communication lines. It will be commissioned in May.

A second station of similar design is being constructed at Nakhoda and is to be commissioned next year. One of its antennas will be trained on a satellite located above the Pacific at 177.5 degrees east. The second will operate with a satellite above the Indian Ocean, overlapping the Odessa station's communications zone. This will ensure global communications for all our country's large ships. Soviet industry is to provide them with Volna S apparatus, including a 1.2 meter-diameter antenna for communication via satellites. A small, cheaper apparatus will be developed later for small ships, primarily in the fishing fleet. Satellites will become sailors' reliable assistants in any part of the world ocean.

SATELLITE TV TRANSMISSIONS RECEIVED IN KOLA

PM060843 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Apr 83 p 3

[Text] Lovozero, Murmansk Oblast, 1 April -- Television screens lit up today in the ancient Lapp village of Krasnoshchelye, situated in the tundra of the Kola Peninsula. A ground station for the Moskva space communications system has been commissioned here. It makes possible the reception of black-and-white and color transmissions from the capital. With the commissioning of the station the residents of practically all isolated villages and settlements in Murmansk Oblast will be able to watch television programs.

AIR DEFENSE FORCES DAY MARKED 10 APRIL

Marshal Koldunov Preview

LD092200 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Apr 83

[Text] Tomorrow is Air Defense Forces Day. At the microphones is Marshal of Aviation Aleksandr Ivanovich Koldunov, commander-in-chief of Air Defense Forces, USSR deputy minister of defense and twice Hero of the Soviet Union.

[Begin Koldunov recording] The Air Defense Forces have travelled a great and glorious road. They have written many bright pages in the heroic chronicle of the land of the Soviets. Legendary feats were achieved in the years of the civil war by the troops and commanders of the first air defense units. The formation and units of the Air Defense Forces carried their banners honorably and worthily through the severe trials of the Great Patriotic War. Attempts to destroy socialism were foiled even at the time when the Soviet state was the only socialist state in the world.

Today, it is even more inevitable that any such attempt will come to nothing. As was pointed out by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his replies to the questions of the PRAVDA correspondent, all efforts to achieve military supremacy over the USSR are in vain. The Soviet Union will never permit this. It will never be unarmed in the face of any threat. Taking account of the increased aggressiveness of imperialism, the CPSU and the Soviet state are forced to strengthen the country's defensive capability to maintain the military might of the Armed Forces at the necessary level. Day and night, in any weather, the Air Defense Forces are vigilantly on duty and maintain a high degree of combat readiness to fulfill the tasks allotted to them. Their military potential is up to current requirements.

The outstanding victories of the Soviet Armed Forces in the battles near Moscow, Stalingrad, Kursk and in other battles of the Great Patriotic War, which are widely marked in the forces, convincingly confirm that our troops worthily multiply the glory of the senior generations of the Soviet people. [end recording]

Ustinov Greetings, Order

LD101838 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Text] Today the Soviet Union is marking Air Defense Day. Defense Minister Marshal Dmitry Ustinov has greeted the servicemen on the occasion. In an order of the day he said that the Air Defense service is ready to continue to safeguard the labor of Soviet people and the gains of socialism in the present conditions when aggressive imperialist circles led by the United States are trying to destroy the existing balance in the world.

Cereimonial Meeting 8 April

PM111214 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Apr 83 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Guarding the Native Sky"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting devoted to Air Defense Forces Day was held 8 April in the Soviet Army Central Academy theater. Working people's representatives of the hero-city of Moscow, servicemen from the capital's garrison, veterans of the Great Patriotic War and Air Defense Forces servicemen gathered here.

The following were in the presidium of the ceremonial meeting: L.V. Smirnov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; I.F. Dmitriyev and N.I. Savinkin, chiefs of CPSU Central Committee sections; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General A.A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Chief Marshal of Artillery V.F. Tolubko, Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov, Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union S.G. Gorshkov and Army General I.N. Shkadov, USSR deputy defense ministers; Admiral A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Marshal of the Soviet Union P.F. Batitskiy; Colonel General S.A. Bobylev, member of the Military Council and chief of the Air Defense Forces Political Directorate; Colonel General of Artillery Ye.S. Yurasov, first deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces; marshals of categories of troops, Army generals, generals, admirals, officers, Air Defense Forces veterans, defense industry workers, designers and representatives of Moscow's public.

The ceremonial meeting was opened by B.V. Nikolskiy, Moscow CPSU Gorkom secretary. An honorary presidium composed of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo was elected to the accompaniment of tumultuous applause.

USSR state prizewinner N.G. Bondarenko, lathe operator at the Lianozovo electromechanical plant; D.A. Okhromiy, Komsomol Central Committee secretary; and Academician V.S. Semenikhin warmly greeted the Air Defense Forces.

The meeting was addressed by Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister. He assured the CPSU Central Committee, the Soviet Government and the Soviet people that the Air Defense Forces, in united formation with the personnel of the other branches of the Armed Forces and the armies of the Warsaw Pact member-countries and fulfilling the historic decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, will continue to vigilantly guard the sacred borders of the motherland and the fraternal countries of the socialist community.

The meeting participants adopted a greetings letter to the CPSU Central Committee. A festive concert followed the ceremonial meeting.

Deputy Commander Yurasov Remarks

LD101330 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0805 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Comments by Colonel General Yevgeniy Sergeyevich Yurasov, hero of socialist labor and first deputy commander in chief of Air Defense Forces; time and place not given -- recorded]

[Excerpt] The Air Defense Forces are also on the front lines defending our country's sacred frontiers during peacetime.

Constant high combat readiness and the uninterrupted conduct of combat duty are a law of life for them. Reactionary imperialist circles, first and foremost of the United States, have sharply aggravated the international situation. They are conducting intensive military preparations. An important priority has been given in their aggressive plans to develop the latest types of long-range aircraft and cruise missiles.

In the face of the growing military threat from imperialism, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government are taking essential measures to strengthen the country's defense and raise the combat readiness of the Armed Forces. In his speech at the November 1982 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Andropov, general secretary of our party's Central Committee stressed: The Politburo has regarded and continues to regard as obligatory supplying the Army and Navy with everything they need, especially in the present international situation. The Air Defense Forces are also supplied with everything essential for the reliable defense of the Soviet Union's air frontiers. They are equipped with various modern anti-aircraft missile systems, first class supersonic all-weather fighter-interceptors and radio-technical systems. This first-rate combat equipment is in the reliable and skillful hands of the air defense servicemen.

The air defense servicemen have greeted their day with new achievements in combat and political training. There has been an increase in the number of excellent sections and subdivisions, first class specialists and those holding qualifications of combat skill. One in three servicemen has distinguished himself in combat and political training. As always, the example is set by Communists and Komsomol members, who make up over 90 percent of the personnel. High results have been achieved by the frontranking sections and subdivisions commanded by officers (Orlov), (?Torgovanov), (Grechishkin), (Kovach), (Kravtsov) and others. In the present study year, the excellent Red Banner Smolensk Guards anti-aircraft missile regiment holding the orders of Suvorov, Kutuzov and Bogdan-Khmel'nitskiy, which is commanded by guards Lieutenant Colonel (Nechayev), has come out as an initiator of socialist competition among our troops, under the slogan: To Raise Vigilance and Reliably Ensure the Security of the Homeland! The successes of the guards-missile forces are a good guide for competing for excellent results each day of combat service and every hour of combat and political training. Commanding officers, political workers and party and Komsomol organizations in the Air Defense Forces persistently work to raise the political activeness of servicemen and to raise them in a spirit of unstinting service to the socialist homeland and the people and in the spirit of loyalty to the heroic combat traditions of the Armed Forces.

Permit me to offer ardent and heartfelt congratulations to all the Soviet people, servicemen and esteemed veterans of the Air Defense Forces, and to scientists and workers in the defense industry on the occasion of Air Defense Forces Day. Along with servicemen in the other branches of the Armed Forces and the armies of the Warsaw Pact countries, the Air Defense Forces are constantly ready to fulfill with honor their sacred duty of reliably defending the gains of socialism and peace.

Deputy Chief Mikhaylov Statement

LD101250 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 10 Apr 83

[Comments in the studio by Major General of Aviation Vyacheslav Grigoryevich Mikhaylov, deputy chief of the Political Directorate of Air Defense Forces, on the occasion of Air Defense Forces Day on 10 April -- live]

[Text] In the postwar years, the CPSU and the Soviet Government, pursuing a peace-loving foreign policy, have shown a tireless concern to strengthen the country's economic and defensive might and to increase the combat power of the Armed Forces.

We are forced to do so by the aggressive aspirations of the imperialist states, above all the United States and its NATO bloc allies.

Present U.S. policies have exacerbated the international situation. In striving to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union, the United States has been pushing ahead with a program to build up its strategic offensive armaments and means of aerial and space attack equipped with nuclear weapons. This places particular responsibility on the Air Defense Forces. They are entrusted with fulfilling a task of state importance: to be on combat duty and ready at any time to repulse a sudden strike by a strong, technically well-equipped and cunning enemy and to defeat him.

To deal with this task, the Air Defense Forces possess up-to-date anti-aircraft missile systems with supersonic and missile-equipped all-weather interceptor-fighters. They are meant to destroy aerial targets at an extensive range and at high speeds, in any weather conditions and at any time of the day or night. The radio-technical forces are equipped with up-to-date radar stations, making it possible to detect aerial targets at great distances and heights and to determine their precise coordinates. The effective use of the combat possibilities of the anti-aircraft missile forces and fighter aircraft is ensured by automated control systems and high-speed communications facilities.

The defenders of the homeland's skies, like all Soviet servicemen, are profoundly aware of the reality of the military danger. They also understand the fact that one will not receive peace from the imperialists simply by asking and that peace needs to be defended. The air defense servicemen are steadfastly perfecting their combat skill and vigilantly carrying out their combat duties. Many of them have been awarded USSR orders and medals for their selfless military labor and Colonel Ivan Yefimovich Zhukov, senior air defense aviation inspector, was given the lofty award of Hero of the Soviet Union.

The air defense servicemen are marking their traditional holiday with the achievement of new feats of combat training. Their great political and combat activity and patriotic upsurge manifest themselves daily in concrete deeds and in the results of socialist competition that has become widespread among the troops under the slogan: Heighten Vigilance and Firmly Maintain the Security of the Homeland! This competition was initiated by the men of the Smolensk Red Banner, orders of Suvorov, Kutuzov and Bogdan Khmelnitskiy air defense guards regiment. Holding sacred and furthering the combat traditions of their regiments during the Great Patriotic War, the missile forces perform their field firing exercises in a masterly fashion and are vigilant in their operational readiness, giving an example of wholehearted service to the homeland that is followed by all the defenders of the air borders of our socialist fatherland. Rallying closely around the Communist Party, the air defense servicemen, shoulder to shoulder with servicemen of other branches of the Soviet Armed Forces and the armies of the fraternal socialist countries, are always on the alert and in a state of combat readiness, guaranteeing a crushing rebuff to any aggressor.